

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TEMPORARY RULES FOR
TAXING THE INCOME OF LIFE
INSURANCE COMPANIES

HON. KEN HOLLAND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the bill that I am introducing today would amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide temporary rules for taxing the income of life insurance companies.

Life insurance companies are taxed under special provisions of the Internal Revenue Code that were enacted in 1959. Due primarily to inflation and historically high interest rates, these provisions have simply not worked in recent years. As a result, the life insurance industry has been subject to rapidly escalating taxes, which have seriously impacted on its ability to provide low cost life insurance and to compete effectively for savings dollars. Some life insurance companies have obtained some relief from this tax burden by using a special provision in the Code called the modified coinsurance tax election.

There is general agreement that the provisions of the 1959 Act need substantial revision. The life insurance industry has worked for over 2 years to develop a comprehensive proposal to deal with the problems. However, there is also general agreement that we do not have time this year to consider a complete revision of the life company tax provisions. Accordingly, today, I am introducing a stopgap bill. The bill would be effective for taxable years beginning in 1982 and 1983. This would give the Congress time to develop a permanent solution to the critical tax problems of the life insurance industry. The bill is designed to deal temporarily with the major tax problems of the industry, while still producing levels of revenue substantially above those currently being paid.

The bill would suspend the modified coinsurance tax election. This is directly responsive to the Treasury Department's concerns about the current loss of tax revenues from the election. However, the bill also addresses, on an interim basis, the major defects in current law that are causing the substantial increase in taxes imposed on the life insurance industry.

It is essential that we correct these defects if we suspend the modified coinsurance tax election provisions. Otherwise the life insurance industry will be faced with an extremely unfair tax

burden. This is illustrated by the following facts:

The life insurance industry's share of total corporate taxes almost doubled from 1959 to 1978 even though the industry's income increased at a lower rate than the income of corporations generally. Even with the modified coinsurance tax election, life insurance companies paid a larger percentage of corporate taxes in 1980 and 1981 than they did in 1959.

Under the 1959 Act as originally implemented, 90 percent of rebates to policyholders in the form of dividends were deductible. Today, except for ModCo arrangements, only 50 to 60 percent of such amounts would be deductible.

This increase in taxes on life insurance companies under current law is harmful to policyholders, life insurance companies, and the economy in general.

Young, middle-income wage earners depend upon life insurance to provide for the security of their families. They have been hurt by excessive taxes which increase the cost of insurance.

Companies are hurt because excessive taxes reduce their ability to compete for savings dollars. Indeed, in some cases, the financial stability of companies may be jeopardized.

The economy is hurt if the tax laws discourage the purchase of life insurance by individuals because life insurance companies have traditionally been the source of about 30 percent of the Nation's long-term investment capital.

For these reasons we need this bill. Now let me describe its principal provisions.

The bill would make three changes to section 809(f) of the Code to ensure that companies can deduct a reasonable amount of dividends and similar amounts paid or credited to policyholders.

First, all dividends and similar distributions relating to qualified insured pension plans would be deductible. This provision would effectuate the clear original intent to exempt investment income attributable to these plans from current tax. Present law, contrary to this intent, operates to disallow deductions for many of these dividends thus subjecting this pension plan investment income to substantial tax.

Second, with respect to nonqualified business, mutual and stock companies would be allowed to deduct, respectively, a minimum of 80 percent and 87½ percent of policyholder dividends and other special amounts. This provision

would give life insurance companies a more adequate deduction for the current high level of dividends they must pay to compete in today's environment of high-interest rates.

Third, all companies would receive a full deduction of at least \$1 million of policyholder dividends and other special amounts. The current amount allowed, \$250,000, has remained unchanged for 23 years. This amendment would restore the assistance to small companies that this deduction was originally intended to provide.

The bill also contains provisions to clarify the treatment of consolidated tax returns filed by two or more life insurance companies. These provisions are necessary so that all companies are able to benefit from the changes concerning the deduction of dividends and other special amounts that I have just described.

The bill would also amend the complex formula that is used to compute a company's exclusion for investment income required to be set aside for policyholders. The current "arithmetic 10-for-1" formula does not work appropriately in the context of current high interest rates. The bill would replace this formula with a "geometric" version of the 10-for-1 rule. This geometric formula more accurately carries out the stated intent of the rule provided in the 1959 Act.

Finally, the bill contains grandfather provisions to clarify the tax treatment of two items for years before the stopgap period. One provision would remove doubt about the tax treatment of companies using the modified coinsurance tax election in years before 1982. Another grandfathering provision would clarify that excess interest credited to policyholders in these prior years is fully deductible.

The bill would increase revenues from the life insurance industry by about \$1 billion in 1982, an increase of about 60 percent from current levels. This revenue increase is reasonable for several reasons:

It eliminates the unintended tax benefits of modified coinsurance but adjusts the taxation of life insurance companies to deal appropriately with the distorting effects of high interest rates and inflation.

The life insurance industry will pay more than 4 percent of total corporate taxes, which by historical standards is more than its fair share.

Any greater tax would raise the cost of life insurance and discourage individuals from providing for their individual and family financial security through life insurance. This could lead

to additional pressures on the social security system if it is forced to take a larger role than it currently has.

The bill would permit companies to deduct a portion of dividends to policyholders that represents a major step back toward the proportions companies could deduct when the law was first enacted.

Recent high interest rates have been principally due to inflation, and it is unfair to impose the kind of tax increase that would result in the absence of this bill.

The bill is the product of many months of study within the life insurance industry and reflects discussions with Treasury and congressional staffs. It responds reasonably to both the need for an appropriate amount of revenue and the special problems faced by the life insurance companies because the provisions of current law do not operate appropriately in periods of inflation and high interest rates. Finally, it provides the time needed for the Congress to review the subject of life insurance company taxation on a more comprehensive basis.

Mr. Speaker, I am including the text of the bill in the record of today's proceedings in its entirety.

H.R. 6045

A bill to provide special temporary rules for taxing the income of life insurance companies

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subpart E of part I of subchapter L of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 ("the Code") is amended by inserting immediately before section 817 the following new sections:

"SEC. 816. SPECIAL TEMPORARY RULES.

"(a) APPLICABLE PERIOD.—This section applies with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1981, and before January 1, 1984.

"(b) MODIFIED COINSURANCE.—

"(1)(A) Section 820 shall not apply with respect to taxable years to which this section applies.

"(B) For purposes of subpart B, if, for the taxable year immediately preceding the first taxable year to which this section applies, section 820 applied in respect of a re-insured insurance or annuity policy then (as of the beginning of such first taxable year) the reserve on the policy reinsured shall be treated as a part of the reserves of the reinsured and not of the reinsurer and the assets in relation to such reserve shall be treated as owned by the reinsured and not the reinsurer.

"(C) For purposes of subpart C, subparagraph (A) shall not apply in respect of insurance or annuity policies covered by modified coinsurance contracts as of the beginning of the first taxable year to which this section applies so long as such coverage with respect to such policies remains in effect, except that if reinsurance of some portion of insurance or annuity policies under a modified coinsurance contract is terminated, then the reserves with respect to such portion, and the assets in relation to such reserves, shall be treated as reserves and assets of the reinsured at the beginning of

the taxable year in which such reinsurance is terminated.

"(2) Section 805(e) shall be read as not including interest payable after the date of the enactment of this paragraph by a reinsured to a reinsurer in connection with a coinsurance contract (other than interest on account of delay in making periodic settlements of income and expense items under the terms of the contract). This paragraph shall apply: for purposes of subpart B, to coinsurance contracts in existence on the date of enactment of this paragraph; and, for purposes of subpart C, to coinsurance contracts entered into after the date of enactment.

"(c) LIMITATION ON CERTAIN DEDUCTIONS.—Subsection (f) of section 809 (relating to limitation on certain deductions) shall be read as follows:

"(f) LIMITATION ON CERTAIN DEDUCTIONS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of the deductions under paragraphs (3), (5) and (6) of subsection (d) shall not exceed the greater of:

"(A) \$1,000,000 plus the amount (if any) by which the gain from operations for the taxable year, computed without regard to such deductions, exceeds the taxable investment income for the taxable year; or

"(B) the sum of—

"(i) the portion of the deduction for dividends to policyholders (determined under section 811 (B)) that is attributable to contracts referred in section 805(d) (relating to pension plan reserves); and

"(ii) so much of the base amount as does not exceed \$1,000,000 plus, in the case of a mutual life insurance company, 80 percent of the excess of the base amount over \$1,000,000, and, in the case of a stock life insurance company, 87½ percent of the excess of the base amount over \$1,000,000.

For purposes of subparagraph (B)(ii), the base amount is the amount by which the deductions under paragraphs (3) and (5) of subsection (d) exceeds the amount determined under subparagraph (B)(i).

"(2) APPLICATION OF LIMITATION.—The limitation provided by paragraph (1) shall apply first to the amount of the deduction under subsection (d)(3), then to the amount of the deduction under subsection (d)(5), and finally to the amount of the deduction under subsection (d)(6).

"(d) ELIMINATION OF TECHNICAL DEFECT IN DETERMINING ADJUSTED LIFE INSURANCE RESERVES, ETC.—

"(1) Computation of adjusted life insurance reserves—paragraph (1) of section 805(c) (relating to definition of adjusted life insurance reserves) shall be read as follows:

"(1) ADJUSTED LIFE INSURANCE RESERVES DEFINED.—For purposes of this part, the term 'adjusted life insurance reserves' means—

"(A) the means of the life insurance reserves (as defined in section 801(b)), other than pension plan reserves, at the beginning and end of the taxable year, multiplied by

"(B) 0.9 raised to the power of n where n is the number (positive or negative) determined by subtracting—

"(i) 100 times the average rate of interest assumed by the taxpayer in calculating such reserves, from

"(ii) 100 times the adjusted reserves rate.

"(2) DEFINITION OF ADJUSTED RESERVES RATE.—Paragraph (1) of section 805(b) (relating to definition of adjusted reserves rate) shall be read as follows:

"(1) ADJUSTED RESERVES RATE.—For purposes of this part, the adjusted reserves rate

for any taxable year is the lowest of the average earnings rate, the current earnings rate, of 0.095.

"(e) CONSOLIDATED RETURNS.—Subsection (f) of section 818 shall be read as follows:

"(f) CONSOLIDATED RETURN COMPUTATIONS.—For purposes of this part, in the case of a life insurance company filing or required to file a consolidated return under section 1501 for a taxable year—

"(1) The computations of the policyholders' share of investment yield under subparts B and C (including all determinations and computations incident thereto) shall be made as if such company were not filing a consolidated return.

"(2) The amount of consolidated life insurance company taxable income under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 802(b) shall be determined by taking into account the amount determined under such paragraphs as the separate life insurance company taxable income (including a case where deductions exceed income) of each life insurance company that is a member of the group. For such purpose, the determination of a company's taxable investment income and gain or loss from operations (after applying the limitation provided by section 809(f)) shall be made without regard to the taxable investment income or gain or loss from operations of any other company.

"(3) If there is a consolidated net capital gain, then the partial tax referred to in section 802(a)(2)(A) shall be on the consolidated life insurance company taxable income reduced (but not below the sum of the amounts determined under section 802(b)(3)) by the amount of such consolidated net capital gain.

"816A. CERTAIN FLEXIBLE AMOUNTS: CONSOLIDATED RETURNS

"(a) AMOUNTS BEFORE 1982.—

"(1) In the case of taxable years beginning before January 1, 1982, if a life insurance company treated amounts described in paragraph (2) as amounts which were not dividends to policyholders (within the meaning of section 811 of the Code) and as amounts not described in section 809(c)(1) (relating to premiums), such treatment shall not be disturbed.

"(2) THE AMOUNTS TO WHICH PARAGRAPH (1) APPLIES ARE—

"(A) amounts in the nature of interest accrued for the taxable year on insurance or annuity contracts pursuant to (i) an interest rate guaranteed or fixed before the period begins, or (ii) any other method (fixed before the period begins) the terms of which during the period are beyond the control and are independent of the experience of the company, whether or not the interest rate or other method was guaranteed or fixed for any specified period of time, and

"(B) any difference between the amount of premiums received or mortality charges made under rates fixed in advance of the premium or mortality charge due date and the maximum premium or mortality charge which could be charged under the terms of the insurance or annuity contract.

"(b) AMOUNTS AFTER 1982.—In applying this part for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1981, no inference shall be drawn by reason of the enactment of subsection (a).

"(c) CONSOLIDATED RETURNS.—In the case of a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1982, if a life insurance company filed a consolidated return under section 1501 then any treatment of items in such return in a

manner consistent with the principles of section 816(e) shall not be disturbed."

SEC. 2. OTHER RULES.

(a) COINSURANCE CONTRACTS.—

(1) Subsection (b) of section 820 of the Code is amended by adding after paragraph (4) the following: "The determination for taxable years beginning before January 1, 1982, as to whether a contract is a coinsurance contract that satisfies the requirements of this subsection shall be made solely by reference to the terms of the contract."

(2) Subsection (c) of section 820 of the Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "For taxable years beginning before January 1, 1982, the rules with respect to coinsurance contracts shall be applied in accordance with the regulations prescribed by the Secretary for purposes of this part as in effect on December 31, 1981."●

FARM CRISIS IN RURAL AMERICA

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, as the storm clouds of a deepening farm crisis gather over countryside America, I want to share with my colleagues a story in Sunday's edition of the New York Times regarding the disastrous economic condition of rural America.

The article clearly describes the fiscal crisis our Nation's farmers are experiencing today. In my home State of Minnesota, State FmHA officials recorded delinquencies at the end of February on 7,885 of the 16,068 loans it has made to about 11,000 farmers. That is a delinquency rate of 49 percent.

The administration's response to the current rural crisis has been inadequate. I recently introduced H.R. 5711, legislation which, during the 1-year period following enactment, will require the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the deferral of the payment of principal and interest on, and forgo the foreclosure of, outstanding loans made under laws administered by the FmHA to farmers who are experiencing temporary economic hardships.

I urge you to join me in this effort to prevent rural America from experiencing another depression and cosponsor H.R. 5711.

U.S. FARMERS SAID TO FACE WORST YEAR SINCE 1930's

(By Gregory Jaynes)

COLUMBIA, Mo.—In barnyard argot or the drier language of the economist, the talk from the Middle West, the High Plains and the Rocky Mountains this spring is that the American farmer has not faced such a make-or-break year in nearly half a century.

On many an agrarian tongue is the word "depression."

Farm sales, the liquidation of assets to pay off debts or merely keep credit payments current, are being held in record

numbers, and bankruptcies and foreclosures have soared.

"For everyone being foreclosed, there probably are 10 who are on the brink and ought to be—not in a moral sense but in a balance sheet sense at present prices," said Harold Breimyer, a University of Missouri agricultural economist. "There is an enormous amount of gambling that conditions will improve. There are literally thousands who cannot survive another low-income year."

In Denver, John Stencil, president of the Rocky Mountain Farmers' Union, said, "Production Credit Associations, co-ops, the Federal Land Bank, those people tell me that by this fall half of their borrowers could be in trouble. I always ask them what they mean by trouble, and they say, 'Well, half of our borrowers might not be able to continue.'"

HIGHEST DELINQUENCY RATE

In Knoxville, Iowa, Richard Hixson, vice president of the Iowa State Bank and an auctioneer at farm sales, said: "I booked four sales last night on the phone and listed two more today. I'd say that's five times as many as I was handling a year ago."

The national rate of delinquency on payments on loans from the Farmers Home Administration is now at 58 percent, the highest in memory. "I've never met a farmer who hadn't just had a bad year," said Stanley Weston, director of information at the Farmers Home Administration, commenting on how farmers love to complain. "But I've been in this business for 25 years and what I'm picking up now is really scary."

The United States Department of Agriculture estimates that the country's 2.4 million farmers were \$194.5 billion in debt on Jan. 1. That is more than double the debt of 1975. In the same period, farm expenses have risen from \$75.9 billion in 1975 to \$141.5 billion in 1981. Net farm income in 1975, pumped up by Soviet grain purchases, stood at \$24.5 billion. Last year, it was \$22.9 billion.

In short, costs are up and income is down. Prices paid for crops, for instance, have risen 34 percent since 1977, but fuel prices have risen 113 percent. The farmer has responded by borrowing more, buying more and raising more—the nation produces roughly 60 percent more food than it consumes.

In the process, the farmer has created a vast surplus in a time when domestic and international demand has weakened. Into 1981, the American agricultural sector was still taking advantage of increasing land values to secure more credit to underwrite more expansion, or merely to stay afloat, and all the while, interest rates were climbing.

"If you take 1980 and 1981," said a top official in the Farmers Home Administration, a Democrat who declined to be identified, "it's the first time since 1933 and 1934 you had back-to-back years in which the cost of producing on the farm was more than what the farmer got for growing it."

He said that in comparing crop prices and growing costs per bushel, "You're talking about \$2.75 for corn and \$4.25 to \$4.75 to produce it."

"Now," he went on, "one thing that has sustained this is they could hock their land, but now the price of farm land is softening. Now the banks and the farm credit system are saying, 'You used up all your credit and we're not going to be able to provide financing.'"

EITHER BORROW OR FOLD UP

"With interest rates what they are now," he concluded, "people who don't farm might can postpone borrowing, but the farmer has to go to that well every spring to borrow for fuel and all the other things that go into making a crop. Either that or fold up."

In the four months from Oct. 1, 1981, the date when the Federal Government's fiscal year begins, to Jan. 31 of this year, the Farmers Home Administration had 871 "voluntary liquidations," meaning the farmers sold out to satisfy debts, and the Government agency foreclosed on 421 farms. In all of 1980, the Government agency had 127 voluntary liquidations, and 133 foreclosures.

"I have noticed a tremendous increase in the number of farmers who come in and see me," said Fred Dannov, an attorney here in Columbia who represents farmers in bankruptcy proceedings. He said the number was up 50 percent over this time last year, declining to give his specific caseload. "The ones I see are mortgaged to the hilt," said Mr. Dannov. "Most of it is a simple matter of bail out."

When a bankruptcy is completed in Missouri, a farming couple is entitled to keep \$15,000 worth of real estate, household furnishings not exceeding a value of \$200 per item, clothing, a motor vehicle for the two of them that may not have a value of more than \$2,400, and \$750 worth of tools.

Joe W. Scallorns, the president of First National Bank and Trust Company in Columbia, said bankruptcies were not all that numerous lately, but added, "Up from almost nothing to noticeable is up. I'd be lying if I didn't say that." Taking an optimistic view, Mr. Scallorns said soaring money costs and low commodity prices were likely to weed out the inefficient farmers.

NOT MUCH INCENTIVE TO FARM

"The only people farming now want to farm," he said. "They love to farm. There's not much economic incentive in it anymore."

Dr. Breimyer, the agricultural economist, said that if he "were to guess I'd say that a fourth of all the farmers are in trouble, are on a fairly thin edge financially."

"There is a further element," he continued. "About half of all farmers now have substantial off-farm income, full- or part-time jobs, or the wife has a job, and the industrial recession is costing quite a few of those jobs. But the most excruciating human aspect is that farmers being forced off their land will have a difficult time getting an off-farm job. I'm a veteran of the Depression of the 30's, and the signals, the marks, the similar traits and characteristics are distressing."

"I was out in the countryside last week with some of my members," said Mr. Stencil of the Rocky Mountain Farmers Union, "and I haven't heard any scarier talk in the 12 years I've been president. They're talking about a full-blown depression. They're talking about trying to find a job in town, while many of our small businesses are laying off people now. The snowball effect in our small communities is already devastating, and they're talking about it getting worse in the fall."

SOME LOANS BEING EXTENDED

By the fall, the Reagan Administration says, the economic picture will be brighter, not darker. Although the most financially fragile farmers are being foreclosed or asked to liquidate, according to Federal authorities, Government lending institutions are

continuing to extend old loans and to make new loans to enable farmers to make a crop. Loans for expansion or more equipment are rare, however.

In North Dakota, where the Farmers Union is just completing a statewide credit survey, Stanley Moore, the organization's president, said that it was "our judgment based on these surveys that all the credit agencies are trying to extend the best financial support they can to the farmers, although there will be some pressure on the part of these agencies to urge farmers to liquidate and get out."

Mr. Moore said that because the planting season in North Dakota came later than in the Corn Belt, there was a "time lag" in analyzing credit requirements and the situation was not yet clear there.

But Richard Hixon, the vice president of the Iowa State Bank, said the picture was already clear and clearly grim. "In The Des Moines Register last Sunday there were 31 farm sales," he said. "Normally when we get into this time of year the farm sales are over. We figure March 15 is it, because anyone continuing on after that already has their machinery purchased by that time. We start sowing oats the last of March, corn the 20th of April."

"JUST LIKE IT WAS BEFORE"

"One year ago last September I sold a farm at auction across the road," Mr. Hixon continued. "It brought \$1,600 an acre. And here the other day a 160-acre farm brought \$700 an acre, one year later. The older people coming into the bank, the ones who went through the last depression, they say it's just like it was before, only on a much, much larger scale."

For their part, farmers want to see commodity prices rise and interest rates sink. The Department of Agriculture would like to see an expanded international market for American agricultural products, and a diminished domestic production.

Interest rates, which have shored the value of the dollar abroad, making American products more expensive for foreign consumers, have not helped the Government market the agricultural surplus, and raising price supports to help the farmer would only insure that commodities sold overseas would be sold at a loss to the Federal Government. Too, with raised price supports, food prices for American consumers would rise proportionately.

"It's going to be traumatic on down the road," said Terry Barr, acting chairman of the World Agricultural Outlook Board of the Agriculture Department. "Rising food prices are going to upset the consumers more than declining farm prices. Any Administration is going to be more interested in cheap food prices than prosperous farmers. The consumer as a body is a larger political force."

Dr. Barr said more international markets for American goods, and agricultural shortages elsewhere in the world, would ball out the nation's farmers this year, but at some point Americans, who spend far less of their incomes on food than people in other nations, would have to become accustomed to more realistic prices.

"You've got to keep your farm sector viable and yet not create tremendous unrest in your consumer state," said Dr. Barr. "Right now it's an untenable situation. We've arrived at that spot between a rock and a hard place and some basic decisions have to be made. Something has to give."

"WE PRODUCE TOO MUCH FOOD"

If Marty Strange had his way, the United States simply would produce little more than it consumes. The head of a small farmer advocacy group, the Center for Rural Affairs in Walthill, Neb., Mr. Strange says, "We produce too much food in this country." He has three actions in mind:

"One, hone credit programs to new public purpose, not just to finance the capitalization of agriculture. Pay attention to social and production values, efficiency, economic opportunity. Secondly, protect the incomes of farmers but only within a range of efficiency. In other words, don't protect the incomes of very large farms. If they want to grow, let them, but don't protect their risk."

"And third," he said, "control supply. Stop producing for the export market, which is speculative, and target our production goals within the capacity of our resources. Right now we produce too much, exhausting our soil and water resources."

Federal bureaucrats, however, discount Mr. Strange's theories as too simplistic and say he has failed to take into account that, among other things, the country's 1981 agricultural trade surplus of roughly \$27 billion offset almost half of the country's petroleum trade deficit.

In the event the matter is taken up with a farmer, theories go out the window anyway. "You can't farm \$1,500-an-acre land," said Bandy Jacobs, who raises cattle, corn and soybeans outside Columbia. "It'll take you all you can produce just to pay the interest."

"The farmer always thinks it'll be better around the curve," Mr. Jacobs added. "He'll lose \$5,000 on this one, turn around and buy another and say he'll make it back the next time. The farmer is the only man that'll sell something and say what'll you give me for it and buy something and say how much you gonna charge me?"

A REPORT EACH MONTH

HON. JOHN L. NAPIER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. NAPIER. Mr. Speaker, the Marlboro Field and Herald, a family-owned weekly newspaper in the Sixth Congressional District, has made special effort to keep its readers in touch with issues on a national level. The editor, my friend Bill Kinney, recently wrote an editorial calling for a monthly report by the President. I submit this editorial for the consideration of my colleagues.

A REPORT EACH MONTH

Last month we editorialized on President Ronald Reagan's great ability to communicate with the American people.

We commented that he was unusually gifted in this respect and we hoped he would continue to appear before the nation via prime time television to identify and amplify the concerns of this nation.

Since our editorial appeared, a great deal has transpired in the world.

President Anwar Sadat has been executed, leaving a great void in the Middle East and removing one of our staunchest defenders from the world scene. The possible sale of AWACS planes to Saudi Arabia has met

with defeat in the U.S. House and faces a close battle in the U.S. Senate. To shore up our intelligence sources in this volatile area of the world, our military has placed AWACS on patrol in Egypt to keep in touch with Libyan and Sudanese activity.

Twice during his administration, the President has called on the public at large to contact their elected representatives in the Congress and urge support for his programs and plans.

And, twice this has worked effectively.

We wish to reiterate our stand that we feel the President would serve this nation well, and help implement his plans for change, if he would plan a regular monthly report to the nation.

We believe that the vast majority of Americans want to support the President in his efforts to bring financial stability to this nation. And, we believe, millions of doubters will join the movement if they see the facts clearly demonstrated.

We hope the President will consider such a proposal and use his skills as a communicator to help lead us into seeing the predicaments we face as he sees them.

No one has more access to better focus on the nation and world today than does he. Take this knowledge and couple it with his God-given talent for imparting confidence and information to others, and we think he offers us a potential monthly television event that would far outstrip all others.

LAW OF THE SEA

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this moment to warn my colleagues and the American public of another serious flaw in the Law of the Sea Treaty.

If this so-called treaty comes into force, all commercial vessels would be subject to increased harassment in the newly created "economic zones" reaching out 200 miles from the shorelines of all coastal states.

During earlier negotiating sessions, the United States was not able to secure high seas rules for vessel transit in these zones.

Instead of hard, clear rules, the relative clause in the treaty was left intentionally ambiguous, opening the door for politically preferential interpretations. Thus, while the U.S. State Department may apply one interpretation, a hostile coastal state—such as Libya—may subscribe to an opposite interpretation. Such ambiguity will swiftly contribute to the erosion of the high seas freedoms of navigation and overflight.

And what has the United States traded for this mess of uncertainty and erosion of high seas freedoms? We have only handed over two-thirds of the Earth and its living and mineral resources to the exclusive control of radical Third World states and the Soviet Bloc.

In Texas, Mr. Speaker, that kind of horse-swapping could easily get a man hanged.●

WISCONSIN COMPANY RECEIVES PRESIDENTIAL AWARD

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, for decades, our Nation has been an advocate and practitioner of free trade. Unfortunately, too few of our corporations and small businesses take advantage of the opportunities presented by the export sector. For example, in 1980, the top 50 U.S. exporters sold \$57 billion to foreign purchasers. These 50 corporations accounted, by themselves, for more than one-quarter of all of America's merchandise exports in 1980.

More companies must take advantage of the opportunities presented by the worldwide marketplace. We want to get our people back to work and want to see an early end to our Nation's economic slowdown. But in order to resume full production, our industries must have outlets for their products. Markets do exist throughout the world and our businessmen need to take advantage of the opportunities that are available in the export field. It is in their own self-interest, it is in the interest of their individual firms, and it is in the overall interests of America that they become more actively competitive in the international marketplace.

To encourage more small companies to enter into exporting, the Department of Commerce offers a full range of specialized services and assistance. Furthermore, the Commerce Department gives special recognition through the Presidential "E" Award to companies that make an outstanding, special contribution to our Nation's export expansion efforts.

This year, only some 50 such firms will be singled out for this prestigious award. I was therefore especially pleased to be asked to present, on behalf of President Reagan and Commerce Secretary Baldrige, an "E" Award to Paper Converting Machine Co. in Green Bay, Wis., on March 15, 1982.

Export performance in the paper-converting machinery equipment industry has been sluggish over the last several years. In fact, this industry has faced increasingly stiff foreign competition which brought the balance of trade in paper industries machinery from a 2 to 1 positive ratio in 1976 to a negative balance in 1979. Yet Paper Converting Machine Co. of Green Bay maintained its exports at a level above the industry average during a period

when the imports-to-consumption ratio more than doubled. The efforts of that company to concentrate on designing machinery exportable to lesser developed countries is especially commendable. It is apparent that the company has consistently striven to maintain its export competitiveness in the face of increasingly severe competition by foreign producers.

This export record was noted by the President's "E" Award Committee when it recommended Paper Converting Machine Co. receive the President's "E" Award for contributions to the export expansion effort of the United States. This award commends the performance of that company as a model for other Wisconsin firms—and for firms throughout America—to follow in combating the challenges of the 1980's.

President Frederick Baer, his staff, and all of the employees of Paper Converting Machine Co. merit high praise for their achievements. They are proof that small and medium-sized businesses can compete in the international marketplace. I was pleased to be invited to participate in the awards ceremony, and hope that the example of this firm will be emulated by thousands more of our Nation's businesses.●

PLIGHT OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, on behalf of myself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. EMERY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. HOLLENBECK, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. WIRTH, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SEIBERLING, and Mr. DOWNEY, a House concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that we will not stand by and let the Environmental Protection Agency be decimated. An identical resolution is also being introduced today by Senators LEAHY and HUDDLESTON.

As you are aware, the plight of the Environmental Protection Agency has reached grave proportions. At a time when the Agency's responsibilities for several crucial environmental statutes are just getting underway, EPA's budget, adjusted for inflation, will be slashed by 45 percent from 1981 funding levels. Despite poll after poll demonstrating the overwhelming support of the American people for our Nation's environmental safety net, and the crucial and sizable responsibilities EPA has for implementing these laws, its budget has plummeted from \$1.352 billion in 1981 to \$961 million in 1983, with even greater funding and person-

nel cuts in sight. These cuts, the suspension of numerous hazardous waste regulations, and the gutting of the enforcement program at the Agency, represent the most egregious abdication of EPA's responsibilities to protect human health and the environment.

Mr. Speaker, let me be more specific about the magnitude of the EPA budget cuts. Research and development programs at the Agency have been sliced to the bone. The administration's EPA budget will cut R. & D. 57 percent below the 1981 funding level, leaving key monitoring programs, health studies, air and water quality testing, and research into toxic chemicals severely crippled. State grants for technical assistance to these programs will dwindle to 31 percent of their previous levels, despite proposals to hand increasing responsibilities back to local governments for these programs.

EPA is giving every indication of rapid back-peddling on efforts to bring hazardous wastes under control. Referrals to the Justice Department for violations under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act have fallen off sharply, and not a single case on the superfund priority list has been referred to Justice for litigation since this administration took office. This has brought a series of resignations and requests for transfers from Justice Department lawyers who have strenuously protested EPA's lack of enforcement action.

Funds for identifying other abandoned hazardous waste dumps and permitting operating facilities have been slashed from \$115 million in 1981 to \$75 million in 1983. The 115 sites listed as superfund candidates due to the imminent contamination and explosion threats many of them pose are not being cleaned up in a timely manner, although the fund will have accumulated \$352 million in unspent funds by the end of next year. The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency seems content with a voluntary compliance program which I believe is extremely optimistic and will not get these sites cleaned up.

Programs to protect water quality and protect the public against the 55,000 toxic chemicals currently in commerce have fared similarly. A group of environmental organizations released a report yesterday entitled "Indictment: The Case Against the Reagan Environmental Program" which details this administration's environmental record. I recommend that you take a moment to look at the disheartening conclusions contained in this document.

These actions, if left unchecked, will take years to repair. The research data base will be lost, new Love Canals will continue to be created, and the morale

of the employees at EPA will continue to fall. It is important that the message contained in this resolution be conveyed to the employees of the Environmental Protection Agency, the American public, and industrial polluters, that this agency will resume its responsibilities under our Nation's environmental protection laws.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for us to express our strong intention to prevent the abrogation of our environmental legislation through misuse of the budget process. The resolution expresses the sense of the House of Representatives that the Environmental Protection Agency should receive an adequate budget in order to carry out its responsibilities for protecting human health and the environment. The resolution also requests that the President submit a new budget for the Agency reflecting these principles, and, I believe, the expressed wishes of the American people. We cannot afford to rob the future in this way. If left unchecked, this is what these policy changes and budget cuts will do.

HOUSE RESOLUTION ON EPA BUDGET

Whereas protection of the environment has always been a bipartisan concern; and

Whereas reductions in the resources of the Environmental Protection Agency have already hindered and threaten to cripple implementation of statutory requirements to control pollution, enforcement of existing standards, and the maintenance of critically important research on environmental health and safety standards; and

Whereas Congress, in a strong bipartisan manner, has mandated that the Environmental Protection Agency undertake increased responsibilities in protecting the environment, safety, and health of all the citizens of the United States under the following laws:

- (1) the Clean Air Act,
- (2) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act,
- (3) the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act,
- (4) the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act,
- (5) the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976,
- (6) the Safe Drinking Water Act,
- (7) the Solid Waste Disposal Act,
- (8) the Toxic Substances Control Act, and
- (9) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980;

Now, therefore, be it *Resolved by the House of Representatives* that it is the sense of Congress that—

- (1) an effective Federal environmental program is necessary for the protection of the health and well-being of the citizens of the United States,
- (2) in order to protect our environment and to meet expanded responsibilities mandated by law, the Environmental Protection Agency should be appropriated increased funds, and
- (3) the President should submit a new budget for the Environmental Protection Agency for fiscal year 1983 reflecting these principles.●

NOTRE DAME HONORS MSGR. ANTHONY GOMES

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mrs. HECKLER. Mr. Speaker, last week, the Notre Dame Club of Rhode Island and Southeastern Massachusetts bestowed its most valued honor on a man who has faithfully and energetically served the community and the university for nearly 50 years.

The Reverend Monsignor Anthony Gomes, pastor of Our Lady of the Angels Parish, was named "Notre Dame Man of the Year"—a tribute reserved for a graduate who has exemplified the heritage, tradition, spirit, and special qualities of the University of Notre Dame.

Monsignor Gomes' attachment to the University of Notre Dame has been aptly described as a unique bond that has stretched into a half-century of unrelenting loyalty.

It is an attachment that began while he was a youth in Taunton, grew during his undergraduate days at the university when he earned varsity baseball letters, and matured in the subsequent 40-odd years.

To receive this honor is indeed fitting for Monsignor Gomes, who in June will celebrate the 40th anniversary of his ordination. Over the years, he has given generously of his time to his parishioners, to his community, and to his university.

He has carried with him the spirit of Notre Dame in each activity he participates—as diocesan director of the annual Catholic Charities Appeal or as fan of the Fighting Irish football team.●

UNEVEN TREATMENT OF VIETNAM VETERANS

HON. DANIEL B. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. DANIEL B. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, during the Senate debate on the Intelligence Identities Protection Act—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, S2358-60, March 18, 1982—the issue of the Peace Corps and intelligence activity surfaced again. Senator ALAN CRANSTON restated his position that President Reagan's appointment of Thomas Pauken as Director of the ACTION Agency necessitated separating the Peace Corps from ACTION because Mr. Pauken had served his country in Vietnam as an Army intelligence officer.

In the course of his March 18, 1982 Senate speech and in a letter to the

New York Times on December 9, 1981, Senator CRANSTON criticized Mr. Donald Thorson, an official of the ACTION Agency. Mr. Thorson answered Senator CRANSTON's remarks in a letter to the New York Times on December 21, 1981. However, the Times chose not to publish Mr. Thorson's reply.

In the interest of fairness I am submitting Mr. Thorson's letter for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He makes some interesting comments on the uneven and often hypocritical treatment accorded Vietnam veterans. As a Vietnam veteran myself, I am appalled by the double standard applied to those of us who served in Southeast Asia.

The letter to the editor follows:

ACTION,

Washington, D.C., December 21, 1981.

MAX FRANKEL,
Editor, New York Times,
New York City, N.Y.

DEAR EDITOR: Senator Alan Cranston sent a letter to the New York Times (Dec. 16) accusing me, as an ACTION official, of "being willing to jeopardize a policy intended to protect the integrity of the Peace Corps and the safety of its volunteers." Some background information should put Senator Cranston's charges in perspective.

Senator Cranston led the opposition to Tom Pauken's nomination as Director of ACTION earlier this year on the grounds that his military service in Vietnam (Mr. Pauken was assigned to army intelligence) disqualified him for the position. The Senator argued that since the Peace Corps was part of ACTION (although autonomous) Mr. Pauken's nomination could be perceived as connecting the Peace Corps to "intelligence". Senator Cranston claimed that Pauken's nomination broke a 20-year tradition. He insisted that no one with any intelligence experience had ever served in a high position in the Peace Corps and that such a move would harm Peace Corps credibility and possibly even endanger volunteer lives (See Congressional Record, S11798).

First of all, Mr. Pauken's nomination did not represent a "break of a tradition" of "over 20 years". The Deputy Director of the Peace Corps from 1969-1971, Tom Houser, had served in army counter-intelligence during his military service in the mid-1950s. In other words, Mr. Houser, a former army counter-intelligence official, held the No. 2 position in the Peace Corps in the middle of the Vietnam war when hostility to American policies and suspicion of American motives ran rampant in the Third World.

If Senator Cranston was truly concerned about the "appearance of a connection with intelligence activity" why didn't he oppose Mr. Houser's nomination in 1969? Senator Cranston stated in his December 16th letter that "no information to that effect (intelligence activity) was brought to the attention of the Senate at the time of Mr. Houser's nomination." Surely, it is not too much to ask of a United States Senator to examine a Presidential nominee's record before giving his "advice and consent". After all, Senator Cranston obtained a detailed analysis of Mr. Pauken's military record in preparation for his confirmation hearings earlier this year.

Furthermore, it is significant that Mr. Houser was Deputy Director of the Peace Corps itself and involved in its day-to-day

operations, whereas Mr. Pauken, as head of ACTION, has nothing to do with the policies of an autonomous Peace Corps.

Also, it should be noted that Peace Corps credibility was not damaged, nor was any volunteer harmed because Tom Houser was Deputy Director.

The question still remains: Why did Senator Cranston, oppose Mr. Pauken (a Vietnam veteran) on intelligence grounds, but support Mr. Houser (a 1950s veteran) with a similar army intelligence background?

Sincerely,

DONALD THORSON,
Assistant Director for
Legislative Affairs.●

THE IMPRISONMENT OF JOACHIM DIETZSCH

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention to the plight of Joachim Dietzsch, a citizen of East Germany who has been imprisoned simply because he expressed a desire for freedom.

Mr. Dietzsch has been adopted as a prisoner of conscience by the Providence, Rhode Island Chapter of Amnesty International in the hope that international concern will pressure the German Democratic Republic to repeal this arbitrary and unfair sentence. In March 1981, Joachim Dietzsch was accused on unspecified grounds—possibly a charge of “impeding public and social activity”—and sentenced to 2 years in prison for publicly expressing his wish to emigrate from East Germany. His arrest constitutes a violation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights which has been ratified by the GDR. Article 19 of this Covenant includes the right to express opinions “freely and publicly.” In addition, Mr. Dietzsch’s arrest infringes upon his right to freely emigrate as set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Mr. Speaker, the arrest and imprisonment of this young man is an appalling example of East Germany’s complete disregard for basic human rights. Such disregard should not and will not escape the notice of freedom loving people throughout the world, and I urge the German Democratic Republic to drop all charges and immediately release Joachim Dietzsch from prison.●

JUDICIAL REVIEW

HON. LARRY McDONALD

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, without question, the Federal judiciary has become a pervasive influence on our everyday lives. Federal judges have told us where our children will go to school, superseded our elected representatives and drawn their own plans for redistricting, and are even attempting to tell us who our telephone company will be. Yet, this power is wielded by judges who are appointed for life and therefore are removable only through impeachment or voluntary retirement. At present, except for impeachment, there is no opportunity to review the actions of these unelected Federal officials.

It is for that reason that I read with particular interest a resolution recently passed by the Georgia General Assembly. The resolution suggests a simple, yet effective, method of responsible review: The record of all Federal judges be reviewed every 8 years and that procedures be established to remove those judges who are found to be derelict in the performance of their constitutional duties.

I recommend to the careful attention and thoughtful consideration of my colleagues the following resolution of the Georgia General Assembly:

A resolution calling upon the United States Congress to pass an amendment to the United States Constitution which would require that the record of all federal judges be reviewed every eight years; and for other purposes

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia:

Whereas the framers of the Constitution of the United States, in their collective wisdom, established a marvelous and unique form of government; and

Whereas the government consists of a centralized form made up of three separate branches but with the ultimate power residing in the people; and

Whereas the legislative, executive, and judicial branches were each created to operate as a check and balance on the exercise of governmental power by each other; and

Whereas federal judges are appointed for life and are therefore removable only through impeachment or voluntary retirement; and

Whereas this system of selecting federal judges appropriately insulates them from the people and the government they serve; and

Whereas it is advisable to improve the manner of selecting and continuing in office the federal judges so that the interests of justice and the people can be best served: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That the Congress of the United States is requested to institute procedures to provide that the record of all federal judges be reviewed every eight years and that procedures be available to remove

judges found to be derelict in the performance of their constitutional duties; be it further

Resolved, That this legislature calls upon the legislatures of each of the several states to adopt similar resolutions and to forward such resolutions to the Congress; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to all members of the Georgia delegation in Congress; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution also be prepared and forwarded to the Secretaries of State and to the presiding officers of the legislatures of the several states.●

STUDENT FINANCIAL AID CUTS A SHORTSIGHTED PROPOSAL

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues a letter I received from Bonnie Gelle, library technician, Itasca Community College, Grand Rapids, Minn. Her letter cites several excellent examples of how financial aid affects a variety of students. In its modest, factual, unemotional statement of the case for continued Federal aid to education, this letter is an indictment of the Reagan administration’s proposals to make further cuts in student financial aid.

Mrs. Gelle’s letter follows:

GRAND RAPIDS, MINN.

DEAR MR. OBERSTAR: I understand that massive cuts have been proposed by the Reagan Administration in student financial aid programs. I think this is a serious mistake and ask that you do your utmost to protect the education of American students who are now and will be depending on an extra hand to help them better their lot and provide better citizens for our country.

As a supervisor of students who are benefiting from work-study and grant programs, I am impressed by the dedication and willingness of these college students to work for their future. There’s Carol, a divorced woman with three young girls, who without the money provided by Federal Work Study, would not have been willing to return to school but might be at home wasting her talents and living on welfare. There’s hope for her future as she acquires some secretarial skills through the programs at Itasca. Her self-worth is enhanced and that alone is worth the money we provided for her education. Her children, drawing from her increased self-worth and confidence, are winners with her for their future is dependent on her today.

There’s also Susie, newly graduated from high school and pursuing her first two years of education at Itasca. Her parents can give her help but her work study is giving them a lift while giving Susie a work experience in a valuable area of the college operation. As a Library Aide during her work study time here the past two years, she has been a

real asset and a student I've been proud to supervise.

There's also Ted, a father of two, whose wife is a nurse and the major provider in their family. Without some help from the financial aid programs, Ted might not be pursuing his educational goals.

My daughter will graduate from high school this year. My husband and I, while not comfortably rich on a combined income a bit over \$30,000 a year, will probably be able to put her through a four year program with minor sacrifices. She will have her chance at education probably without financial aid. But I urge you, for the other three I named above and for millions of other college age students, who are the future of America, to do your best to preserve their chances. I'd be proud to know that my tax dollars were going toward their education and their future rather than toward someone's aim of world dominance.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

BONNIE GELLE,
Library Technician.●

TOBACCO MEETING

HON. JOHN L. NAPIER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. NAPIER. Mr. Speaker, America's agricultural strength is equally as important as its industrial might. To maintain this Nation on a strong economic basis, we must have a compatible combination.

As the representative of a district which provides a large portion of our Nation's tobacco products, I have made a continuing effort to focus attention on the importance of our tobacco industry and the effect of Government upon it.

Just recently, through the efforts of a bipartisan coalition, we were able to continue the economic underpinning of tobacco and maintain it as a viable link in our balance of trade. We know that the tobacco price support program will continue to face challenges by nontobacco-oriented interests if some changes are not made. That is why the House Agriculture Committee's Tobacco and Peanuts Subcommittee has been on a serious quest for information through field hearings.

These hearings are deemed important to the people who earn their livelihoods from tobacco. They are willing to participate in assisting Government and they came forth in great numbers to offer recommendations. In that light, I offer the following article which was printed in the Hemingway, S.C., Weekly Observer on February 18.

TOBACCO MEETING

It was a good feeling to attend the public meeting with the U.S. House Tobacco and Peanut Subcommittee.

The sensation was aroused by two facts. First, the crowd of farmers and warehousemen in attendance was inspiring. Some 800 people crowded into the auditorium at Flor-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ence-Darlington TEC to hear the testimony (many of them stood for the entire morning session). If that doesn't indicate that people from this area are interested in maintaining the tobacco program, what does?

Second, every person testifying before the committee agreed that the program must be changed in order to make it more viable. A major concern was how to strengthen the program so that anti-tobacco interests won't have such an easy time in future arguments against it.

In order to make sure that the program can be operated without costing taxpayers, many recommendations were offered to the committee. Three of them were suggested repeatedly.

First, an assessment to growers should be established. Second, the price support formula should be modified. And third, a fund or pool should be established in order to underwrite losses that could possibly come up in the future.

Like the congressmen on the committee told those in attendance, it is up to those in the tobacco family to recommend how the program should be changed. That is an important part of the entire process, because it is those people involved in the production and sale of tobacco which know the program the best.

One important thing to remember, however, is that the fight does not end now that the meeting is over. It is just beginning.

When the committee finishes conducting its public meetings in the five tobacco states, it will take the information it has gathered to Washington. That is where the real fight will take place.

It is imperative that every farmer, warehouseman and buyer stay on top of future tobacco proceedings, and that they support the efforts of the committee to make the tobacco program work beneficially for everyone.●

BUSINESS WEEK OPPOSES NFL ANTITRUST EXEMPTION

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I have on several occasions risen to denounce the arrogance which the National Football League has shown in seeking congressional enactment of legislation to effectively exempt the league from the Nation's antitrust laws. As I have pointed out, this proposed measure serves no useful public purpose, and in view of the record \$2 billion television contract recently signed by the league and the three networks, has no economic justification whatsoever. Its sole effect would be to free the NFL from its present litigation involving its refusal to allow a replacement football franchise for the Los Angeles Coliseum while creating for it a special niche among American businesses.

Recently, Business Week, a publication not known for its revolutionary views, joined in denunciation of the NFL's attempt to solve its self-created antitrust problems through special-interest legislation, and I commend their

editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

[From Business Week, Apr. 5, 1982]

FOOTBALL SHOULD COMPETE

In 1922 the Supreme Court, for reasons best known to itself, decided that baseball was not a business and granted it immunity from antitrust laws. Some congressmen want to end that immunity, but even while they ponder the move, the National Football League has started a drive to win antitrust immunity for itself. About the only thing more ridiculous than that idea would be for Congress to take it seriously.

Not even NFL Commissioner Pete Rozelle, the quarterback of football's lobbying effort in Congress, argues that football is not a business. In fact, he positively revels in the NFL's \$350 million annual gross revenues and its new \$1.9 billion contract for TV coverage rights for professional football games. But, complains Rozelle, "in professional sports, literally every action, every business judgment, and every decision of a league is now subject to attack under the antitrust laws." Rozelle may be amazed to learn that every other business faces exactly that same situation every day and that it is precisely the point of the antitrust laws.

Football's drive does not seem to be winning much support. But the NFL is planning to add two new teams, and talk is heard that they might wind up in Tennessee and Arizona if Senate Majority Leader Howard H. Baker Jr. (R-Tenn.) and Judiciary Committee member Dennis DeConcini (D-Ariz.), who, by no coincidence, represent those states, can be persuaded to shepherd the bill through the Senate. They should resist the temptation. Football team compete vigorously, even violently, on the playing field, and the businessmen who own them must accept competition in the marketplace.●

BEST IN THE WEST

HON. CHARLES PASHAYAN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. PASHAYAN. Mr. Speaker, collegiate basketball fans throughout our land can now sit back and analyze this past season and dream about the next campaign that will lead to Albuquerque, N. Mex., site of the 1983 National Collegiate Athletic Association Tournament. North Carolina won the 1982 edition in New Orleans, Georgetown University stole the favor and fervor of the fans, and in my hometown of Fresno, they are proudly proclaiming that the Bulldogs of Fresno State University were "the best in the West."

Fresno State and the Pacific Coast Athletic Association stand ready to receive some of the accolades usually reserved for the Atlantic Coast Conference or the Southeastern Conference; they have a firmly placed foot in the door.

Many of my constituents are proud members of the Red Wave, one of the few fan support groups that receive banner headlines and its own publici-

ty. And as Fresno Bee sports columnist Bob McCarthy noted:

Off the Georgetown results (Fresno lost 58-40) FSU's basketball program might now be considered the best in the West, to go along with its No. 1 fans (Red Wave) and its numero uno coach (Boyd Grant). And there's always a demand for the best.

I should like to share with my colleagues some of the accomplishments of this year's winning combination by inserting the article from the Fresno Bee.

BEST IN THE WEST
(By Terry Betterton)

Boyd Grant had a good feeling Tuesday night—with good reasons.

The Fresno State University basketball coach held court at the Fresno Convention Center Exhibit Hall. He listed his reasons before an estimated 1,600 fans at the FSU basketball awards dinner, including:

The winningest team in FSU history, 27-3. The winningest team in Pacific Coast Athletic Association history.

A third straight Sun Met Tournament championship.

Only the second PCAA team ever to finish the season ranked in the Top Ten.

A 47.1 defensive record, the sixth best in history.

Holding 20 of 30 opponents to 50 points or less.

The best basketball player in Fresno State history.

The last reason was Rod Higgins, who stole the show. The 6-foot-7 senior from Harvey, Ill., capped a brilliant career by being named the Bulldogs Most Valuable Player for the second straight year.

In fact, Grant noted, it was a unanimous vote by his teammates.

It was also an easy choice. He earlier received awards as the team's top scorer with a 15.1 average and leading rebounder with a 6.3 average. Add to that the Dr. Pepper Player of the Year award and Higgins was holding a full house.

If Grant needed any proof that Higgins ranks at the top of the Bulldog basketball honor roll, he need look no further than the alltime FSU statistic charts. Higgins is on nine different career lists: second in free-throw percentage, .805; third in field-goal percentage, .532; fourth in scoring, 1,402 points; fifth in field goals made, 554; sixth in free throws made, 294; seventh in assists, 200, and field goals attempted, 1,042; eighth in rebounds, 603; and ninth in free throws attempted, 365.

But Higgins shared the spotlight with several teammates.

Donald Mason was honored as the best defensive player after setting a school record with 52 steals. Tyrone Bradley, the junior guard who finished the season with a flurry, was named the most improved player.

Bobby Davis received the Bulldog Award. "He started when I asked, was a reserve when I asked," said Grant. "Maybe Bobby is the person that is the best example of what we are as a team."

Two other seniors shared the most inspirational award, reserve seniors Paul Reed and John Weatherspoon. "They will always be successes," said Grant. "It is not always the guys that play that turn out the best."

It was a special night, especially for the seven seniors on the team—Higgins, Mason, Davis, Reed, Weatherspoon, Dan Sezzi and Keith Postler—and a fitting conclusion to an emotional, successful, championship season.

Standing ovations were the order of the night. Grant got two, Higgins got two, the seniors as a group one. Even the pep band got a standing ovation.

When Grant was first introduced, the crowd stood and started chanting, "Defense, Defense." When the entire team was presented, the chant was "Go, Dogs, Go."

To the seven seniors, Grant gave a final bit of advice:

"I hope you will always be accountable and do your best—and be on time."

The last part drew the biggest laugh from Mason, who was suspended for one game after being late to a team meal.

"It has crossed my mind that we were only four games from winning it all," Grant said, referring to the fact that the Bulldogs reached the West Region semifinals of the NCCA playoffs.

FSU President Harold Haak said it all, as far as the fans were concerned: "We are here to honor, truly, the best in the West."

**THE ZEST FOR LIFE OF A
PROUD ST. LOUISAN**

HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I read recently in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of the recovery efforts of a woman known and loved by many St. Louisans, Charlotte Peters. As a singer, entertainer, and talk show host for 21 years, Charlotte Peters won the hearts of many with her humor, compassion, and down-home zest for life. After helping so many through the difficult days of their lives, Charlotte Peters has been challenged by a series of misfortunes that have put her exuberance for life through a trying period. After the death of a beloved spouse and then several strokes, one might expect the enthusiastic fires that burned in Charlotte to quiet down. On the contrary, according to the accounts I have read, Charlotte continues to seek the best out of life and still tries to bring the best out of people with a song or a simple smile.

Missing from this account of the renewed vigor of Charlotte Peters is the big role she played in my first effort to win a seat in Congress in 1976. Whether it was visiting a senior center, appearing at civic and social meetings, or just stopping to talk to her many fans at a shopping center, Charlotte was an untiring booster of my candidacy. There were times when I thought her endorsement was worth the weight in gold of all the newspaper presses in my hometown.

Charlotte Peters touched my life in much the same manner that she did for countless others—with selfless enthusiasm. Her sense of community spirit has always been her trademark. At a time in her life when she could use an occasional boost from her many friends in St. Louis and in the enter-

tainment business everywhere, I hope that more than a few take a moment to remember her and repay her for all those years of thankful, contagious enthusiasm for living.

I ask that the article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat be inserted in the RECORD at this time.

**RECOVERING CHARLOTTE PETERS HAS KEPT
HER ZEST FOR LIFE, COLLINSVILLE FRIEND
SAYS**

(By Charles J. Oswald)

Zesty St. Louis singer-entertainer Charlotte Peters, who became a household name during the 1950s and '60s as the result of her popular television show, will meet with old show-biz friends when she touches down in Las Vegas for a week's vacation at Wayne Newton's Aladdin Hotel.

Mrs. Peters, who suffered a series of strokes two years ago, is well on her way to recovery and "still belts out a mean blues song," said her close friend, Gary Day of Collinsville.

The gregarious entertainer, who captivated St. Louis television audiences with her zany humor and exuberant songs, will celebrate "her 39th birthday" Monday, Day said.

Mrs. Peters was the star of radio and television shows for 21 years in St. Louis, recorded five record albums, performed in live stage productions here and made numerous commercials.

She dropped out of the limelight in the mid-1970s after the death of her husband, William Peters, a sales representative for the Rhea Manufacturing Co., who died Nov. 21, 1974, after a lengthy illness.

Mrs. Peters' life took an abrupt change in 1970, when she was fired from her KTVI, Channel 2, show after publicly suggesting that the city bar a "Rock Festival of Life" sponsored by the radical Yippies group in Forest Park at the same time as a Boy Scout Camporee.

Six months later, her husband suffered a stroke, and she spent the next four years until his death caring for him.

In 1979, Mrs. Peters' life took still another turn when she suffered a series of strokes that left her speech impaired and was hospitalized at Deaconess Hospital for three weeks.

Since suffering the stroke, she has improved markedly and has remained active, serving as a volunteer nurse's aid at St. John's Mercy Medical Center, traveling, singing and shooting pool with her longtime pal Minnesota Fats.

"Her speech has gotten better," Day said, noting that "she almost lost it after the stroke."

"Charlotte did not lose her mental capabilities, and she can still belt out a song," Day said. "Just about every time we go somewhere where there is a band, Charlotte is asked to sing."

The singer's favorite nights out on the town frequently include a stop at the Robert E. Lee riverboat restaurant, where she teams up with her friends in the St. Louis Levee Band to sing old standbys like "Won't You Come Home", "All of Me" and "My Bill", Day said.

"Charlotte is a fishing freak," Day said. "She loves to go to the races, and she never loses. She likes the horses, and she plays a mean hand of poker. She's the busiest 'retired' person I've ever seen."

Mrs. Peters learned to shoot pool from no less than "the greatest," Minnesota Fats,

and frequently pays a visit to Fats' rural Illinois home near Du Quoin to brush up on her game.

While she has been semi-retired from the entertainment world since her stroke, her fan mail and correspondence with show business friends she made during her career continues unabated.

"She still gets lots of mail from her friends and fans," Day said, noting that Mrs. Peters makes a point of answering the daily deluge of mail.

Mrs. Peters is in the process of selling her large Webster Groves home to get a smaller, easier-to-care-for house, and still drives the mint-condition 1969 Mercury Marquis convertible her husband bought her as a gift in 1969—the same car she drove onto the set on her television show at Channel 2.

She is an active member in the St. Louis Council on World Affairs and an avid traveler.

She has been to Europe 10 times and plans an 11th trip sometime this summer, Day said. She also plans to spend some time touring and relaxing in the Caribbean after her trip to Las Vegas.

A native St. Louisan who grew up in the area of Lafayette Square, Mrs. Peters began her entertainment career after her marriage.

"I have an eight-grade education and I never had a music lesson," she said.

"This lady has never stopped wanting to learn things. She never lets her mind slow down," Day said, referring to Mrs. Peters' seemingly boundless energy.

"Her body might have retired, but her mind hasn't. She likes to swim and take long walks with her Shetland-collie dog, Katie," Day said.

One of the proudest moments in recent years came for Mrs. Peters in April 1981 when her son, Michael Peters, won the Pulitzer Prize for an editorial cartoon that appeared in the Dayton (Ohio) Daily News.

Peters, 38, was a staff artist with the Chicago Daily News before joining the staff of the Dayton paper in 1969.

Mrs. Peters' daughter, Mrs. Pat Schwarz, lives with her husband, Herbert, in St. Louis County.

During her planned trip to Las Vegas, Mrs. Peters hopes to renew old friendships with show-biz personalities Wayne Newton, who appeared on her television show several times before making it big, and Bob Hope, Day said.

"There isn't an entertainer that doesn't know Charlotte," Day said. "She's always got that twinkle in her eyes and she still has many, many friends." ●

PAUL CRAIG ROBERTS: BEHIND THE DEFICIT HYSTERIA

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, one of the most curious aspects of the economic policy debate has been the sudden worry among Keynesians, who used to preach a moral imperative for deficit spending, over deficits. This is especially curious because we are now in the midst of a recession, which in Keynesian theory calls for pumping up demand by running deficits.

Does this mean that the liberal Keynesians have become fiscal conservatives? Not at all. As Dr. Paul Craig Roberts explains in today's Washington Post, those who decry the deficit really mean that they want to raise tax rates. They do not agree with those of us who believe that the way to balance the budget permanently is through spending restraint and incentives for economic expansion.

Dr. Roberts' argument carries all the more weight because he has been involved in the congressional budget process for many years and served with distinction as Assistant Treasury Secretary for Economic Policy. I commend his article to my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 30, 1982]

BEHIND THE DEFICIT HYSTERIA

(Paul Craig Roberts)

An almost forgotten economic theory, vanquished long ago by the Keynesians, has been resurrected in Washington. Old-times remembers it as the [British] Treasury view. It states that deficits drive the economy down because they impair confidence. Over the past few months "the Treasury view" has elbowed aside the monetarists and the supply-siders along with its Keynesian conquerors and taken over policy-making in Washington.

Keynes laid the responsibility for the Great Depression at the feet of this theory, because it calls for reducing demand during recession in order to fight deficits. Yet the remnants of his once-proud disciples are strangely silent as an unholy alliance of senators and administration officials threatens once again to respond to recession deficits by tightening the economy's belt. Indeed, Keynesians are egging on the process of treating a faltering economy with austerity, a process they once likened to treating a loss of blood by bleeding the patient.

Recently I testified before the House Ways and Means Committee. On the panel that was testifying it were several notorious Keynesians, one—Paul Samuelson—crowned a Nobel laureate. As I listened to him exhort the Reagan administration for bringing the ruin of deficits upon the country. I could not fight off the vision of this distinguished economist at work at his desk turning the pages of his multi-editioned textbook, which taught the virtues of deficits to the postwar generations, and stamping them "canceled." What was going on? Why all of a sudden were financial market participants panicked by budget deficits? All of them were born to budget deficits. Not only were they educated by Samuelson's text or its imitations, but the financial markets have known no other experience than budget deficits for the last 20 years.

As I listened to Samuelson warn the committee about the deficits caused by the tax cuts, it suddenly clicked, and the hidden agenda was revealed. It wasn't the deficits that disturbed him; it was the tax cuts.

The Keynesian revolution enshrined budget deficits as the primary policy tool for maintaining a growing economy and full employment. Strictly speaking, a tax cut is a legitimate Keynesian tool, and Keynesians themselves once employed it "to get the economy moving again."

But there was another facet to the Keynesian revolution—the Galbraithian one that stressed the dearth of public goods:

there was an abundance of private goods—things like tail-fins—but nowhere near enough of the things we really needed, which only government could provide. Tax cuts could fuel the capitalist economy along, but they would allocate the society's resources into selfish and wasteful private goods serving ego needs manufactured by Madison Avenue. Deficits caused by increases in government spending programs, however, would permit the expansion of the public sector. They would also buy a lot of votes, and the policy was off and running.

That's why the personal income tax cuts have few friends in Washington. They threaten the expansion of the public sector and the vote-buying game that politics has become. That's why politicians and economists, who have reassured us so often of the palliative effects of budget deficits, now see disaster in the third-year tax cut.

Why else would they be going on about something as ordinary as a budget deficit, especially in 1983, a year of economic recovery? If anything, the deficit projected for 1983, at 3.1 percent of GNP, is smaller than normal recovery-year deficits of late. In 1976, when the economy was recovering from the 1974-75 recession, the deficit measured 4.5 percent of GNP. And in spite of (Keynesians would have said because of) the larger deficit, that recovery was stronger than the "rosy" one that the Reagan administration is predicting.

The deficit hysteria is a cover for wrecking the tax cuts and getting on with the business of government spending. The same politicians who are wringing their hands over the deficit are voting funding increases billions of dollars above the president's budget.

Maybe that's why the Keynesians are not protesting the resurrection of "the Treasury view." Let this old ghost scare away the timid tax-cutters, and soon government will be back to fighting recession with deficit spending. Keynesians don't really want to treat the whole economy with austerity, only the private sector. ●

HELSINKI SINKING

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Pointer Economist Newspapers, serving suburban Cook County, Ill. maintain an excellent coverage of foreign policy issues. I was very impressed with their March 21 editorial which dramatically discussed the true factors involved in the Soviet signing of the Helsinki accords. I wish to insert the editorial for the attention of the Members:

[From the Pointer Economist, Mar. 21, 1982]

HELSINKI "SINKING"

Leonid Brezhnev signed the Helsinki Accords on European Security and Cooperation in 1975 because the document amounted to de facto Western recognition of post-war Soviet territorial gains. But the Helsinki agreement also included, at the insistence of Western leaders, pledges to promote

human rights on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

Predictably, Mr. Brezhnev and company haven't lived up to their end of the bargain. Human rights advocates in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe still tend to end up in the gulag somewhere, witness the fate of Solidarity's leaders in Poland.

The follow-up conferences provided for in the Helsinki agreement were intended as forums for discussion of any violations of the accords. Thus, Soviet and Polish officials felt constrained to sit relatively still in Madrid while listening to a litany of Western denunciations of the dictatorship of Warsaw.

Even so, it took something close to a Western threat to cancel the Madrid conference to get this "concession." And all the complaining in the world isn't likely to revive an independent labor union in Poland.

Whether the so-called Helsinki process is worth preserving depends in part on the Soviet bloc's willingness to permit open criticism by Western delegates in Madrid and succeeding conferences. If Western delegates are to be gagged in the name of preserving a "business-like" diplomatic atmosphere, as both Polish and Soviet delegates suggested in Madrid, the Helsinki process is a fraud wholly without redeeming value.

As it is, the Helsinki accords have been violated from the day they were signed by the Soviets, and the Helsinki "process" is hanging by a thread. The very next attempt to choke off debate on the Polish question or any other legitimate human rights matter would sever that thread.●

NATIONAL MEDICAL LABORATORY WEEK IS PROCLAIMED

HON. BOBBI FIEDLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Ms. FIEDLER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to bring to the attention of the House today an event which will occur during our upcoming district work period.

The Coordinating Council for Clinical Laboratory Technology, a national organization made up of several professional societies, has designated April 11-17, 1982, as "National Medical Laboratory Week." The purpose of this week is to inform the general public of the important role of the clinical laboratory professional within the total health care delivery system. In my own community, a new organization of medical laboratories has been formed to be known as the San Fernando Valley Chapter of the California Association for Medical Laboratory Technology.

Mr. Speaker, laboratory medicine and the laboratory professionals who practice it are a crucial aid to the physician. Technical personnel in medical laboratories are highly trained, highly educated individuals who perform a wide range of laboratory tests essential to the detection, diagnosis, treatment, and study of disease. These professionals work hand-in-hand with

physicians providing the necessary data for accurate diagnosis. Yet, there is a critical shortage of qualified personnel to perform the over 25,000 lab tests performed weekly in the San Fernando Valley alone. One blood panel may include up to 24 tests performed by several individuals.

Medical laboratory professionals work in hospitals, clinics, research centers, universities, doctors' offices, and independent laboratories. They include pathologists, research scientists, medical technologists, lab assistants and ancillary personnel. Medical technologists, who perform the actual tests in the laboratories, receive their education in colleges and universities and in hospital schools of medical technology. Licensure of medical technologists in California requires a B.A. degree plus one year of clinical lab training or its equivalent.

There are approximately 350,000 medical laboratory professionals employed nationwide. The San Fernando Valley alone employs over 3,000 lab professionals in some 30 hospital, independent, or commercial laboratories.

In the lab, these professionals analyze blood and other body fluids for evidence of disease or infection. In a large laboratory, medical technologists often become specialists in several clinical laboratory disciplines such as immunology, toxicology, chemistry, microbiology, endocrinology, cytogenics, or nuclear medicine. Routine testing procedures include such common ones as cholesterols, blood alcohols, blood counts, blood sugars, PAP smears, and thyroid testing, among others. More specialized or sophisticated testing includes therapeutic drug monitoring, chromosome analysis, aminocentesis, analysis of poisons and drugs, and tissue section analysis.

Laboratory medicine has kept pace with other scientific and medical breakthroughs. Technological advances in testing procedures have significantly changed the role of laboratory professionals. Testing procedures which used to take hours when performed manually now take only minutes, even seconds, on computerized instruments and equipment now in most clinical laboratories. The results are more reliable and crucial diagnostic decisions based on test results are often made within a matter of minutes. However, there are also those tests which will always be performed manually and require from the laboratory professional individual care and attention exercised in a precise and accurate procedure.

Because laboratory medicine has remained behind the scene for so long, many people are unaware of the significance of the role it plays in modern medicine. It is my hope that National Medical Laboratory Week will be used to educate the public and inspire some young people to take up this satisfying and worthwhile profession.●

**ROD FREEMAN, OUTGOING
PRESIDENT OF THE LOMITA
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE**

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, these are busy days for us in our Nation's Capital. But, while we wrestle with the many complex problems which face us today, we must never forget the many constituents in our districts who serve their communities in very important ways and do not receive adequate recognition. One of these individuals is Rod Freeman, who was honored earlier this year as outgoing president of the Chamber of Commerce in Lomita, Calif.

To the residents of Lomita, Rod needs little introduction. By his tireless involvement and commitment to numerous civic organizations he has clearly distinguished himself as a true leader in the community. A few of the groups which Rod has devoted his time and efforts to are the Los Angeles Junior Chamber of Commerce, the YMCA—Southbay Industry Section, the Vernon Chamber of Commerce, the California Dairy Industry Association, the Red Cross, the Printing Industries Association of Southern California, and the Al Malaikah Temple Guard.

Mr. Speaker, in these times when many of our constituents are not familiar with their neighbors and decline to get themselves involved with community projects, it is truly heartwarming to come across an individual such as Rod who has contributed so much to the improvement of his city. His devotion to Lomita clearly makes him one of my district's outstanding people.

My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating Rod Freeman for a job well done. We extend our heartfelt best wishes and appreciation for the contributions he has made to the people and community of Lomita. We also send to Rod and his wife, Sheryl, and their five sons, Douglas, Dick, Dirk, Brett, and Reed, our sincere hopes for a bright and prosperous future.●

**WE DON'T NEED AN F. D. R.
MEMORIAL**

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about proposals to erect a memorial to President Franklin Delano Roosevelt in West Potomac

Park. The chairman of the D.C. Taxicab Committee, Irving Schlaifer, recently testified before the House Administration Committee about his reasons for opposing the monument. I would like to share his remarks with my colleagues:

REMARKS OF IRVING SCHLAIFER

Mr. Chairman and Members of this Committee, my name is Irving Schlaifer. I am Chairman of the D.C. Taxicab Committee. I am also a professional sightseeing tour guide. I am speaking in behalf of those that I represent in the taxicab industry and the sightseeing industry.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, our 32nd President, is on record saying, "That the only monument that he ever wanted in Washington, D.C. was something that would be no larger than his desk." We now have a handsome white stone marker, the size of his desk with his name on it, located in a small triangular shaped park at the southeast corner of 9th & Pennsylvania Avenue NW., on the northside of the National Archives Building.

All of us want to do something that really honors such a great president. But, it is an absolute sin to authorize the spending of more than \$24,000,000, plus an annual operating cost of over \$763,000 for the proposed FDR Memorial.

There is absolutely no need to spend these millions of dollars on the proposed FDR Memorial in West Potomac Park calling for a meandering 1,000 foot granite wall, 12 to 14 feet high around the western edge of the Tidal Basin, with waterfalls, fountains and sculpture.

The Nation's Capital is already saturated with more than enough monuments, memorial manmade waterfountains, waterfalls, waterpools and lakes. These manmade water fountains, waterfalls, waterpools, and lakes are expensive to build, operate and maintain. They are constantly being turned off or emptied to be worked on and repaired. They are constantly being turned off or emptied to save money. Believe me, nothing looks worse then to see them turned off. Imagine, if you would, seeing the beautiful Tidal Basin emptied of its water. It would look like an ugly ditch. Imagine, if you would, seeing the beautiful Potomac River emptied of its water. It, too, would look like an ugly ditch.

We now have the Berlin Wall built by the Communist in the city of Berlin, separating East Germany from West Germany. It leaves a very bad taste in everyone's mouths. Are we to see this proposed FDR Memorial become known as the Roosevelt Wall? Will it become known as the Roosevelt Taxpayers' Wailing Wall? Will it also leave a very bad taste in the American taxpayers' mouths?

There is a taxpayers' revolt going on now. The taxpayers are sick and tired of our elected officials wasting our hard earned tax dollars on grandiose memorials, monuments and public works projects. The taxpayers are going to the ballot boxes and are voting to replace those public officials that are guilty of wasting the taxpayers hard earned dollars.

Leave the West Potomac Park just as it is, a beautiful spacious park, separating the Jefferson Memorial from the Lincoln Memorial. Do not clutter it up with the proposed FDR Memorial. All that you need to do is change the name of the West Potomac Park to the FDR Memorial Park.

If the proposed FDR Memorial had no competition, it would become an instant suc-

cess. Since it must compete with all of the other well established points of interest, such as, the White House, U.S. Capitol Building, U.S. Supreme Court, Library of Congress, F.B.I., Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Smithsonian Museums, National Art Galleries, Washington Monument, Lincoln Memorial, Jefferson Memorial, Shrine of the Immaculate Conception on the Catholic University grounds, Washington Cathedral, Mount Vernon the home of President George Washington, our first president, Georgetown, Embassy Row, etc., the proposed FDR Memorial will become an instant failure. The millions of visitors that now come to see all of the important points of interest in the Washington, D.C. area, just do not have the time and money to see it all. The sightseeing industry tour guides have to constantly juggle the time schedules to show what is most important for them to see. These millions of visitors to the Nation's Capital will get turned off by one more memorial.

A former Congressman Gray from Chicago, worked hard and sold the other Members of Congress the idea that the beautiful railroad station, the Union Station, should be changed into the National Visitors' Center. Over \$60,000,000 was spent to do it. It became a complete failure. The National Visitors' Center was closed down. The railroad station will eventually be restored to its original use. But, it will probably cost over \$60,000,000 to do it. Where will the money come from? From the poor taxpayers, of course!

Must we have the same thing happen to the proposed FDR Memorial? It just cannot compete with the other memorials, monuments, museums, art galleries, churches, etc. If the FDR Memorial had no competition, it would become an instant success. But, since it must compete with all of the other well established points of interest, the FDR Memorial will become an instant failure.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt was the only man to be elected to the U.S. presidency four times, and at that, in a row. He was a man for the times and above all, a man of action.

The proposed memorial for FDR, made up of a series of 12 to 14 feet high stone walls, a thousand feet long, is not fitting enough for such a great man.

FDR should have a living memorial, an exciting memorial, a useful memorial.

The new \$100,000,000 Washington Convention Center is now being built and will be completed and opened to the public in 1983. It will be a place of action.

The city officials should rename the Washington Convention Center to the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Convention and Visitors' Center.

I urge the Members of Congress to call the Mayor of Washington, D.C. and the members of the D.C. City Council and urge them to publicly support changing the name of our now being built convention center to the FDR Convention and Visitors' Center. I am certain that they will be pleased to hear from you.

This concludes my statement.

I have several additional exhibits that I wish to include in the record being made today. Thank you for letting me place these additional exhibits in the RECORD.●

MARION CHAMBER OF COMMERCE * * * BUILDING A BETTER COMMUNITY

HON. JOHN L. NAPIER

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. NAPIER. Mr. Speaker, recently an outstanding citizen in my district was presented the Distinguished Community Service Award by the Marion, S.C., Chamber of Commerce. I would like to present those comments for the RECORD which point with pride to the impact that one citizen can have on the countless lives within his community.

Cartrell A. Brown is a man who has lived life to its fullest. He has given of himself and used his limitless energy and knowledge for the betterment of his fellow human beings. These are the words his peers used to describe him:

DISTINGUISHED COMMUNITY SERVICE AWARD

This award recognizes persons in our town who, over the years and in some ways, have made contributions which made the community a better place for all of us. This room is full of people who have done just that, but all cannot be singled out for this honor. I like to think of this individual award as being one that actually recognizes the whole community and all of its citizens who serve so unselfishly. That individual speaks for us all. He acts for us all. He is an example of the kind of people we are. The persons who receive it are mirrors of the community. The man to whom we give the plaque tonight is truly a bright and shining mirror of what we are.

Mr. Cartrell A. Brown, affectionally known to all of us as Cartrell, came to Marion in 1948. I have known him all of those thirty-four years as a friend, a public servant, a professional in his field, and a gentleman—loved by his family, friends, and associates.

Cartrell was born in Chester in 1918 and spent his youth there. When this country went to war, he went right along with the rest of us. He served in the United States Army for three years. A month before he was released, he accomplished his greatest feat—he and Elsie Gallman of Newberry were married. She shares with him all of the things I will tell you about him in a moment. They have a daughter, and they are now proud grandparents.

Let me start by telling you about Mr. Brown's present status. In 1978 he was appointed City Recorder, or JUDGE as he is called. He sits on the high bench in the City Court Room and graces it with dignity and honor. He has a fine sense of humor about the work and the people with whom he deals—where humor is often a scarce commodity—but where it eases the strain of the tense atmosphere. He sees no white, no black, no yellow, no Baptist, no Methodist . . . nothing but the person in front of him and to whom he deals out justice with compassion.

Cartrell received his B.S. Degree in Agricultural Education from South Carolina State College in 1948. In November of that year he came to Marion as an employee of

the Extension Service. In 1962 he was promoted to Associate County Agent. In 1972 he was promoted to District Rural Development Coordinator for the State. In 1976 he retired from the Extension Service. When those 28 years are added to the 3 in the Army and the 3 already served as City Judge, they make 35 years of dedicated public activity.

Cartrell is a member of St. John A. M. E. Church where he has been a member since 1948. He served as chairman of the Parsonage Committee, as a teacher of the ladies Sunday School Class, and presently serves as a senior on the Steward Board and on the Trustee Board.

In his city public life, he has served as a member of the Citizens Advisory Committee; a member of the County Planning Commission for economic, social, and housing development; and presently serves on the City Opera House Committee.

Cartrell's love for his work as a teacher and as a guide to others, which he learned so well in Extension Service, led him onward in that field of public endeavor. In 1971 he was elected as a member of the Board of Trustees of Marion School District No. 1, and he is there today serving as vice chairman. In 1977 he was appointed a member of the Board of Trustees of the Marion-Mullins Vocational School (this very school where we meet tonight) and he is still there—serving now as its chairman.

I do not want to end this presentation with this list of all of his community work without telling you that he prides himself as a barbecue chef, a part-time baby sitter, a hunter, and a fisherman who can tell just as tall tales as any of you sportsmen, a card player of renown among his friends, a person who raised pheasants and trained bird dogs and beagles, who even builds boats for a hobby. How he gets time to help Mrs. Brown with the Floral Shop is a mystery—maybe he doesn't as much as he brags about it. His close friends tell a host of wonderful and humorous stories about him.

All in all, he has served his community, his family, his church, and his fellow man. He is unselfish, much loved and highly revered. He is truly a mirror of the Marion community. ●

THE PRESS AND INTELLIGENCE

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to an excellent editorial that appeared in the Detroit News on February 23 regarding the press and intelligence. It briefly states that while the press enjoys certain rights under our system of government, it also must fulfill its obligations in regard to objectivity, prudence, and accuracy. The editorial follows.

[From the Detroit News, Feb. 23, 1982]
A FINE LINE

The Washington Post reports that President Reagan has approved a CIA scheme involving Latin America paramilitary forces to disrupt the Cuban-Nicaraguan supply line to Salvadoran guerrillas. An Associated Press account quotes an unnamed "congres-

sional source familiar with U.S. plans in Central America" who assures, "the administration's focus is Nicaragua."

We suspect that in coming weeks some congressmen will condemn the president's Machiavellian methods, commentators will score the administration's "callous disregard for international law," and Phil Donahue will probably entertain the womenfolk by inviting a priest to recount his experiences with the noble Nicaraguans.

The United States has a curious and unnecessary problem. During the past two decades, the American press has gotten itself deep into the business of purposefully influencing foreign policy.

Consider this most recent "revelation" about the administration's "plans" for Central America.

People pick up their newspapers and learn that the president is considering covert action against a hostile government. Mind you, this is a forecast—not a story after the fact.

It's inconceivable that this, or any other administration, should be obliged to submit its intelligence strategies to a national media referendum. Yet this is precisely the effect of a news story that "leaks" possible strategies in advance.

We can't help but wonder what effect such "investigative" journalism would have had on the outcome of World War II.

What if the press had revealed that the U.S. Navy had broken the Japanese code, or that President Roosevelt was pressing scientists to build—ye gods—an atomic bomb? What if the journalists reported that various Allied diversions were merely a ruse to mask the Normandy landing?

There's a fine line between the public's right—and its need—to know everything the government is doing. And when those doings concern clandestine activities specifically directed by the president of the United States, the Media should exercise restraint.

Many American reporters now assigned to Central America are ignorant of the strategic implications of the leftist wave rolling through that part of the hemisphere. Aligning themselves emotionally with the rebels, they represent an extraordinary asset to the Soviet-Cuban axis, which is supplying and directing the guerrillas.

There's plenty to criticize about El Salvador's regime, but reforms have been implemented—yet they are all but ignored by U.S. journalists.

We have a suggestion. When you read a dispatch from Central America or watch TV films of the troubles there, ask yourself these questions: Does the reporter appear to be objective? Can you detect his sympathies? Is he revealing U.S. military secrets? Would his work please or displease Brezhnev and Castro?

Such questions, of course, don't add up to a perfect test. But asked over time, they will tell you something you should know.

NUCLEAR MADNESS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHUGH) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and

the others of my colleagues who initiated this vital debate on the nuclear arms race. It is the most critical issue ever to confront Congress.

I am pleased to participate in this historic effort to focus attention on the nuclear madness which the Reagan administration is seeking to promote. As one of the sponsors of the call to halt the nuclear arms race, I am gratified that an international grassroots effort has spread supporting a mutual United States-Soviet nuclear weapons freeze.

I can think of nothing more important to this Congress and the world than taking genuine steps for mutual arms reduction. That is why I am participating in this debate and why I am cosponsoring so many measures aimed at arms control, including House Joint Resolution 434, which calls on Washington and Moscow to adopt a mutual freeze on nuclear arms, followed by major systematic reductions in current arms levels.

The principal arguments against this nuclear freeze effort are that it would freeze the United States into a position of military inferiority to the Soviet Union. I must say that I feel that the people who are criticizing this freeze on that ground are doing so on an emotional and irrational basis because the important question really is not whether or not we have more weapons than the Russians of one kind or another, or of all kinds; the real question is, Do we have sufficient weapons and sufficient ability to deliver those weapons or to be able to deter any Soviet attack?

The question is: Do we have sufficient nuclear capacity so that if the Russians were to initiate a first strike, we could wreak unacceptable destruction on the Soviet Union, and do they know that? Clearly we do—and clearly they know it.

The fact of the matter is that the amounts of money that we are proposing to spend on increasing our nuclear arsenal is deterring our ability to have a strong national defense. The administration is projecting \$1.6 trillion in defense costs over the next 5 years, and the chairman of the House Budget Committee (Mr. JONES) calculates it at \$2.4 trillion. I mean that is just mind boggling.

I submit that this level of expenditures will undermine the security of the United States.

First of all, it is already causing us to have severe cutbacks in items in our national economy which are essential to our national defense. You cannot have a strong national defense without a strong industrial base. We are losing the industrial base on which we can base a strong national defense and we simply cannot afford to put all of the U.S. resources into more weapons that will not increase our security and

not do the things which are necessary with our own society to make sure that if we are attacked we will indeed be able to respond.

One of the greatest threats to our national security is our dependence on foreign oil. We are cutting out, for alleged budgetary considerations, attributable largely to this spending on nuclear weaponry, all the efforts to get ourselves off of imported oil, and yet a sunken ship in the Strait of Hormuz represents a far more realistic threat to the entire industrial activity of the free world.

We are seeing a situation at the present time where our industries are collapsing, where our basic infrastructure of our industries, our highways and our bridges, are collapsing. We are seeing our transit system rapidly disappearing and we will soon become the only major nation in the world that does not have a national railroad system.

How can we have a strong national defense without the ability to get our people to and from their jobs, without the ability to get our goods to market? We are told because of this huge expenditure on nuclear weaponry and delivery systems that we do not have enough money to be able to educate our children, that we are going to have to end the financial support for people to attend graduate school and sharply curtail the financial support to enable people, regardless of their means, to attend college.

How on earth do you have a strong national defense in today's technological age where defense means missile systems and tanks and computer communications if you do not have an educated population?

The Reagan administration's stand on accelerating the nuclear arms race is the crowning glory of a myriad of senseless, destabilizing, and dangerous policies. It is thus especially gratifying to see so many Americans finally rise up against this huge, senseless nuclear arms buildup with its so-called tactical nuclear weapons and "winnable" nuclear wars and resist the administration's policies which are leading us on a course toward unprecedented nuclear calamity.

President Reagan has initiated the most massive buildup of nuclear weapons in U.S. history, yet it has not even defined a coherent military or foreign policy. The administration is planning a 6-year \$222 billion expansion of nuclear forces, involving land, sea, and air-based missiles, space weaponry, civil defense systems, and more. In the next decade, Reagan's policies would add 17,000 new nuclear weapons to the 30,000 already existing in the U.S. nuclear arsenal.

The stated purpose of this policy is to achieve the capacity to fight and win a nuclear war—a goal as unattainable as it is dangerous. The adminis-

tration defends its buildup by claiming that we are vulnerable to the Soviets. In response to our repeated calls for priority efforts to control the development, testing, and deployment of nuclear weapons, the administration has used distortions and inaccuracies to portray our present nuclear capability as inferior to the Russians.

There is only one important fact in this equation, however—it is not comparability that matters, but sufficiency—and we clearly have sufficient nuclear power—in fact, the United States has far more power than needed to destroy Russia should it attack—and Russia knows it. That is what matters—not whether we outnumber the Russians or they us in particular weapons systems.

Even using the administration's comparisons, however, the United States and the Soviet Union are in rough parity today, each possessing advantages and disadvantages in its nuclear weapons capability. For example, the United States leads the Soviets by 9,400 deliverable strategic nuclear warheads to 7,800, according to the Center for Defense Information. Moreover, our warheads are more survivable because of more diverse U.S. strategic force deployments.

Despite the clear sufficiency and even advantage in strategic nuclear warheads possessed by the United States, the administration has argued that the Soviets are at an advantage in nuclear "megatonnage." But, as Paul Warnke, former director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said in a recent interview which appeared in the *New York Times*:

The fact that they might have a 2-megaton warhead compared to our modest ones of something like 400,000 tons of TNT only makes one difference: How big is the hole going to be where the high school used to be.

Again though, all of these comparisons are irrelevant. We have more than enough power for our security already. Despite the incredible redundancy of nuclear weapons, the Reagan administration wants to continue spending hundreds of billions of dollars to fuel the arms race, paralyzing our Nation's economy and social structures while perilizing international security.

The administration's continued development of more sophisticated nuclear weapons and delivery systems on this massive scale has created the impression that the United States is building a nuclear force to destroy the Soviet Union's nuclear arsenal in a preemptive attack. As the United States and Russia approach preemptive capabilities, we both become much less secure, requiring hair-trigger launch-on-warning policies. Enormous amounts of money will be spent and we will be less secure than ever.

As the military budget is absorbed by destabilizing nuclear weaponry, really needed expenditures are denied for conventional forces, spare parts, improved pay and technical training for our military personnel. We deny our soldiers sufficient education and training necessary to understand the tenets of military strategy and even how to operate the sophisticated weapons to which we entrust our national security. Thus, again we will be less secure ever.

But the nuclear arms race is not the only problem risking nuclear destruction of humanity. We need not only a freeze on nuclear weapons development but on the transfer of the materials and equipment for producing nuclear weapons.

The development of nuclear power on an international scale also carries with it the risk of increasing the number of countries that will have access to the technology and the materials for nuclear weapons. Specifically, nuclear enrichment and reprocessing facilities and breeder reactors are direct sources of bomb-quality materials—highly enriched uranium-235 and plutonium.

If countries decide to use these facilities to develop nuclear weapons, the rate of nuclear proliferation could increase and with it the chance of a provoked nuclear war or nuclear blackmail by terrorists, against which there is no defense. While we can deter Russia from nuclear war by making it suicidal, there would be no adequate response if a Qadhafi or an Arafat gains access to a nuclear bomb. The only realistic recourse is to prevent terrorists from gaining access to weapons.

During the past decade, the United States has expressed increasing concern over the proliferation risk associated with nuclear power.

By 1985, 25 nonweapon countries will have operational power reactors, each generating enough spent fuel to manufacture a score of bombs annually if the plutonium is separated from the fuel. More important, some of these countries plan to build reprocessing facilities that will enable them to separate the plutonium from spent fuel. Once separated, the plutonium could be put to weapons use quickly. Other countries have or are building enrichment plants that could be used to enrich uranium-235 to bomb grade levels.

The Reagan administration would greatly exacerbate this problem by condoning, even promoting the introduction and use of these sensitive nuclear technologies and materials on a commercial scale throughout the world. Once introduced, they would be impossible to safeguard effectively, providing too easy access to any terrorist group and nuclear weapons ca-

pability to countries that might use them for blackmail or in local conflicts if they got pressed to the wall.

The result could be incredible carnage in the late 20th century from the spread of nuclear weapons to other countries, and the possibility of a third country provoking a nuclear war between the United States and Russia.

The world's most volatile regions—the Middle East and South Asia—already include five countries reported either to have the capability to construct nuclear weapons or to be actively seeking that capability. In a worst case, Libya, Israel, Iraq, Pakistan, and India could all have nuclear weapons within a few years. The actions of these countries will not be independent of each other; the nations are connected in a complicated fashion by enmity and cooperation—thus, the acquisition of nuclear weapons by one of these nations is likely to generate similar actions by others. The region has suffered from major wars every few years; the introduction of nuclear weapons into these wars could threaten millions of deaths in the region, the destruction of the petroleum transportation facilities through which 40 percent of the Western world's oil must pass, and the threat of annihilation of much of the world's population through fallout or the provocation of wider nuclear conflict.

Even the fear that one of these nations was attempting to acquire nuclear weapons could lead to armed conflict. The Iraqi nuclear program already has been the subject of assassinations and an air attack with conventional munitions.

Of these five countries, three of their governments came to power through internal military takeovers. Nuclear weapons in such internally unstable countries may not remain in the hands of the national governments; subnational forces attempting a takeover are likely to try to seize the nuclear weapons. Sooner or later, nuclear weapons or the material for their manufacture may fall into the hands of smaller military units or terrorists groups.

The Middle East and South Asia is the most dangerous region for nuclear proliferation in the near future. But the capability to manufacture nuclear weapons reportedly has been sought by South Africa, South Korea, Taiwan, Argentina, and Brazil. And this is only the situation in the early 1980's. The acquisition of nuclear weapons by one country is likely to lead to a "chain reaction" in which the enemies or rivals of that country then feel that they must acquire nuclear weapons. Some politicians in Nigeria, for example, have already called for a Nigerian weapons program aimed at the possibility that South Africa will acquire nuclear weapons. The same applies for Syria vis-a-vis Iraq.

Proliferation need not stop with the acquisition of a few bombs of the type used by the United States against Japan at the end of World War II—weapons that in the context of a small nuclear war could cause millions of deaths. The next step can be thermo-nuclear weapons—raising the death toll to tens of millions of people or more. Or the next step may be long-range delivery vehicles spreading the threat of nuclear destruction to nations far removed from the regional conflict. In short, proliferation is a major international security threat; and it will certainly get worse if we do not take the lead with the other nuclear weapons powers to stop it.

For these reasons American policy has long featured a strong consensus opposed to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Reagan administration, however, it striving to undermine the good bipartisan U.S. example set by previous Presidents. Not only is Mr. Reagan indifferent to the proliferation risks posed by civilian nuclear technology, he has graphically illustrated that indifference by considering the use to make nuclear weapons of plutonium derived from spent fuel produced in civilian nuclear powerplants.

Even worse, he is considering, for the first time in our history, the export of sensitive reprocessing and enrichment technologies to nonnuclear weapons countries.

Such exports would have tragic consequences and must not be permitted. I intend soon to proposed legislation to block Mr. Reagan's thoughtless move. The United States simply must exercise its strongest leadership with its allies to prevent nuclear profits from overcoming the restraint necessary for nuclear-age survival.

Thankfully, there are Americans who are seeking to correct these irrational policies and to change our course away from nuclear devastation. They recognize that nuclear war is not winable, as this administration has claimed. And they realize the danger in spending hundreds of billions of dollars on a massive nuclear weapons buildup, without incorporating arms control and proliferation prevention into our national security policies.

I commend those who are resisting these senseless administration initiatives, and I pledge my efforts to do all I can to see that Congress does everything in its power to reverse those policies which come to us from the White House. Our efforts to stop this nuclear madness are essential if we are to live in a secure, stable, and peaceful world.

I am including in today's RECORD the text of House Joint Resolution 404, followed by the text of "The Call To Halt the Nuclear Arms Race." I commend both of these important resolu-

tions to the attention of my colleagues:

H.J. RES. 404

A joint resolution on nuclear weapons freeze and reductions

Whereas the greatest challenge facing the earth is to prevent the occurrence of nuclear war by accident or design;

Whereas the nuclear arms race is dangerously increasing the risk of a holocaust that would be humanity's final war; and

Whereas a freeze followed by reductions in nuclear warheads, missiles, and other delivery systems is needed to halt the nuclear arms race and to reduce the risk of nuclear war;

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

1. As an immediate strategic arms control objective the United States and the Soviet Union should;

(a) pursue a complete halt to the nuclear arms race;

(b) decide when and how to achieve a mutual and verifiable freeze on the testing, production, and further deployment of nuclear warheads, missiles, and other delivery systems; and

(c) give special attention to destabilizing weapons whose deployment would make such a freeze more difficult to achieve.

2. Proceeding from this freeze, the United States and the Soviet Union should pursue major, mutual and verifiable reductions in nuclear warheads, missiles, and other delivery systems, through annual percentages or equally effective means, in a manner that enhances stability.

CALL TO HALT THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE—PROPOSAL FOR A MUTUAL U.S.-SOVIET NUCLEAR-WEAPON FREEZE

The horror of a nuclear holocaust is universally acknowledged. Today, the United States and the Soviet Union possess 50,000 nuclear weapons. In half an hour, a fraction of these weapons can destroy all cities in the northern hemisphere. Yet over the decade, the USA and USSR plan to build over 20,000 more nuclear warheads along with a new generation of nuclear missiles and aircraft.

The weapon programs of the next decade, if not stopped, will pull the nuclear tripwire tighter. Counterforce and other "nuclear warfighting" systems will improve the ability of the USA and USSR to attack the opponent's nuclear forces and other military targets. This will increase the pressure on both sides to use their nuclear weapons in a crisis, rather than risk losing them in a first strike.

Such developments will increase hair-trigger readiness for a massive nuclear exchange at a time when economic difficulties, political dissension, revolution and competition for energy supplies may be rising worldwide. At the same time, more countries may acquire nuclear weapons. Unless we change this combination of trends, the danger of nuclear war will be greater in the late 1980s and 1990s than ever before.

Rather than permit this dangerous future to evolve, the United States and the Soviet Union should stop the nuclear arms race.

A freeze on nuclear missiles and aircraft can be verified by existing national means. A total freeze can be verified more easily than the complex SALT I and II agreements. The freeze on warhead production could be verified by the Safeguards of the

International Atomic Energy Agency. Stopping the production of nuclear weapons and weapon-grade material and applying the Safeguards to US and Soviet nuclear programs would increase the incentive of other countries to adhere to the Nonproliferation Treaty, renouncing acquisition of their own nuclear weapons, and to accept the same Safeguards.

A freeze would hold constant the existing nuclear parity between the United States and the Soviet Union. By precluding production of counterforce weaponry on either side, it would eliminate excuses for further arming on both sides. Later, following the immediate adoption of the freeze, its terms should be negotiated into the more durable form of a treaty.

A nuclear-weapon freeze, accompanied by government-aided conversion of nuclear industries, would save at least \$100 billion each in US and Soviet military spending (at today's prices) in 1981-1990. This would reduce inflation. The savings could be applied to balance the budget, reduce taxes, improve services, subsidize renewable energy, or increase aid to poverty-stricken third world regions. By shifting personnel to more labor-intensive civilian jobs, a nuclear-weapon freeze would also raise employment.

Stopping the US-Soviet nuclear arms race is the single most useful step that can be taken now to reduce the likelihood of nuclear war and to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to more countries. This step is a necessary prelude to creating international conditions in which:

Further steps can be taken toward a stable, peaceful international order;

The threat of first use of nuclear weaponry can be ended;

The freeze can be extended to other nations; and

The nuclear arsenals on all sides can be drastically reduced or eliminated, making the world truly safe from nuclear destruction.●

THE GRAIN ELEVATOR BANKRUPTCY BILL

HON. M. CALDWELL BUTLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend the Bankruptcy Code to provide for expedited determinations of interests in grain and the proceeds of grain held by debtors who own or operate grain storage facilities. I am pleased to be joined in this effort by my colleagues from Kansas (Mr. GLICKMAN), Iowa (Mr. BEDELL), New Jersey (Mr. RODINO), New York (Mr. FISH), California (Mr. EDWARDS), Oklahoma (Mr. SYNAR), Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), Louisiana (Mr. HUCKABY), and Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) which I trust will help facilitate swift passage.

This measure is an appropriate response to a problem on which the Sub-

committee on Monopolies and Commercial Law held 2 very useful days of hearings last month and regarding which many of us have heard from our constituents and others who are rightfully concerned. The nature of the problem is this: When grain elevators fail it is not just the owner or operator who is swept into the toils of the bankruptcy court. Those farmers who have delivered grain to the elevators suddenly find their sole marketable assets cannot be recovered or paid for. To the extent that there is delay in the process of ordering abandonment of the grain under section 554 of the Bankruptcy Code or determining ownership interests and relief from the automatic stay under section 362(d), those farmers, who are blameless in the bankruptcy, may be injured, perhaps grievously so.

My bill is based on a proposal recommended to our subcommittee by the National Bankruptcy Conference, a policy advisory body of eminent academics, judges, and practitioners who rendered invaluable assistance to the Judiciary Committee during the preparation of the 1978 code. In critical part it provides that the bankruptcy court "shall expedite the procedures for the determination of interests in and the disposition of grain and proceeds of grain, by shortening to the greatest extent feasible such time periods as are otherwise applicable for such procedures, and by establishing, by order, a timetable for the completion of each applicable procedure." The bill does not give the court an option. The bill is mandatory. The court must attempt to do this.

The bill, which is limited to grain of all kinds, specifies the considerations which should bear upon the shortening of the time periods, including among other factors any need of an entity claiming an interest in such grain or proceeds of grain for a prompt determination of their interest, any need of such entity for a prompt disposition of such grain, and the market for such grain. It sets a framework for expedition. It makes clear that sale of the grain can take place before resolution of all issues. It recognizes the expertise that can be gained from the appropriate State agency by requiring the trustee to consult with such agency before taking any action relating to the disposition of grain in the possession, custody, or control of the debtor or the estate.

In sum, this is a good bill, a workable bill, a bill which makes appropriate amendments to the code to respond to the legitimate concerns of farmers caught up in the consequences of a grain elevator bankruptcy for which they bear no responsibility themselves. I would welcome additional cosponsors.●

NUCLEAR FREEZE SPECIAL ORDER

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the issue of nuclear disarmament, Denver, Colo. contains some of the most aware, sensitive, and knowledgeable people around.

There is good reason for this. Denver sits dangerously close to Rocky Flats nuclear weapons production plant, Cheyenne Mountain Norad Center, the Air Force Academy, and Warren Air Force Base, possible site for the MX missile.

Allow me to insert for the RECORD statements made by these people in conjunction with the nuclear freeze special order that took place on Tuesday. They are the ones who know the true meaning of peace and the consequences of nuclear war.

Representative PATRICIA SCHROEDER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SCHROEDER: Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony at the hearing on this crucial issue.

The Loretto Disarmament/Economic Conversion Committee grew out of the concern of the Sisters of Loretto, a community of over 700 Roman Catholic Sisters, about the escalating nuclear arms race. At a gathering of our community in 1979, the group unanimously declared "its commitment to an end to the production of nuclear weapons," stating, "We are particularly committed to encouraging and assisting in the urgent work of educating ourselves and others to the perils of the continued proliferation of nuclear arms. Rooted as we are in our Judeo-Christian heritage, we view our opposition to nuclear weapons as an urgent moral imperative."

Since that time many members of our community, and the members of this committee in particular, representing the community, have worked, through education and action, to halt the arms race. In the past two years, the committee has especially promoted the Bilateral Nuclear Weapons Freeze Proposal.

When our work began, it was the hope of the community that in two or three years, such a reality as the mutual freeze on nuclear weapons would be in place—as a first step toward lessening the risk of nuclear war and reducing the huge nuclear arsenals of the two superpowers. However, to our great disappointment, not only has the freeze not been accepted by the executive branch of our government and by the Pentagon, but a military budget greater than ever before has been proposed. Indeed, the budget calls for so many advanced first-strike weapons that we fear that our country will be led, not by our leaders in Congress, but by the new generation of nuclear weapons themselves, their accuracy, speed, and design serving to set our policy.

We make our own the words of our church leaders who have called repeatedly for an end to the nuclear arms race, and who have urged "the continued develop-

ment and implementation of policies which seek to bring these weapons more securely under control, progressively reduce their presence in the world, and ultimately remove them entirely." (National Conference of Catholic Bishops, November, 1976.)

Pope John Paul II, visiting Hiroshima over a year ago, pleaded for the abolishing of all nuclear weapons. More than 60 Catholic bishops in this country have spoken out forcefully in condemnation of the arms race, many of them specifically supporting the Bilateral Nuclear Weapons Freeze Proposal.

We affirm the clear position of the Catholic Church (a position surely shared by countless other Christian bodies, Jewish bodies, and other faith communities), stated by Cardinal Krol of Philadelphia in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in September, 1979:

"(1) Our obligation to control the threat of nuclear destructiveness is more fundamental than the requirement to limit the possession of certain weapons.

"(2) The use of any strategic nuclear weapons whatsoever against any targets, even in response to prior Soviet use of them, is morally unacceptable.

"(3) Any threat to use the strategic nuclear arsenal is condemned. Even deterring the Soviet Union by threat of nuclear retaliation for aggression is out of bounds morally because it is immoral even to intend to do what is intrinsically immoral.

"(4) The church lends its moral authority to the quest for bilateral and legally sanctioned limits on weapons."

We stand in solidarity with the poor of the world, especially since we believe that the bloated U.S. military budget for nuclear arms represents an organized assault on the poor, illustrated by the many cuts in the federal budget that have done away with or greatly debilitated human service programs.

We are alarmed that some military planners in our government have spoken almost cavalierly about the possibility of waging and surviving a "limited" nuclear war. We urge that those planners listen to the many experts, especially the large number of physicians and scientists, who have pointed out the utter folly of believing that a nuclear war is survivable. We think that the federal government's renewed emphasis on civil defense plans in case of nuclear attack is a way of lulling the U.S. public into thinking that such "defense" is truly possible. We will not be lulled. We renew our commitment to speak out against the nuclear arms race and to urge many other citizens to make their voices heard in support of the Bilateral Nuclear Weapons Freeze Proposal.

We have been profoundly moved by the now famous article by Jonathan Schell recently published in *The New Yorker*. "It has sometimes been claimed that the United States could survive a nuclear attack by the Soviet Union," he wrote, "but the bare figures on the extent of the blast waves, the thermal pulses, and the accumulated local fallout dash this hope irrevocably. They spell the doom of the United States. And if one imagines the reverse attack on the Soviet Union, its doom is spelled out in similar figures."

We join with many others from U.S. faith communities and other groups, determined, with the help of God and with a dedication to stand for life and for peace, to work to avoid doomsday anywhere on our planet.

Sincerely in the cause of peace,

LORETTO DISARMAMENT/ECONOMIC

CONVERSION COMMITTEE,

Sisters Mary Luke Tobin, Pam Solo, Anna Koop, Carol Dunphy, Cecily Jones, Mary Peter Bruce, Marie Francis Kenoyer, Paulette Peterson.

STATEMENT TO CONGRESSWOMAN PATRICIA SCHROEDER

Physicians for Social Responsibility/Denver, a local chapter of a 10,000-member organization of physicians, other health professionals, and concerned citizens, calls the attention of the Congress of the United States to these facts:

In the event of an all-out nuclear war, or a so-called "limited" nuclear war, the medical consequences alone in the United States would be devastating. To cite a single example, a one-megaton air burst over any large metropolitan area might produce 10,000 seriously burned casualties, according to many estimates. The entire United States has only 2000 specialized burn care beds. Crushing injuries from falling buildings, deafness and ruptured lungs from blast effects, acute radiation sickness producing vomiting, coma, and death, and all of these in combination—this is a likely outcome of nuclear war. Physicians, nurses, and other health professionals will be killed in numbers greater than the general population because they are concentrated in the cities. And their hospitals, their drugs and equipment, even electricity and fresh water—all these will be absent. Nuclear war would be a medical nightmare.

The unknown effects of nuclear war may be more deadly than the known effects. As the Office of Technology Assessment has noted, the calculation of the effects of nuclear war is filled with unknowns. Casualties would be higher than official estimates, because official estimates fail to consider victims of burns, radiation, and delayed fallout. The long-term increase in cancer of all types and birth defects will be staggering, based on the Japanese experience. Crops and forests will die off, producing incalculable effects on human life and the entire ecosystem. There is reason to believe that the ozone layer of our atmosphere—that fragile barrier that by its existence permits life to flourish on earth—will be damaged, possibly beyond repair.

In this context, civil defense and mass evacuation have no meaning except as a hoax. Effective civil defense requires deep underground blast shelters, hardened against direct hits by multi-megaton warheads, provided with oxygen, food, medical supplies, water, and the capacity to bury the dead. These would have to house a large fraction of the population for several months. Such a project is literally beyond the available resources. And what sort of world would face the emerging shelterees after months of hiding? A devastated world that would be unable to support them, or possibly any life. Similarly, to speak of mass evacuation is to deny reality and give false assurances. So-called "crisis relocation" zones would be known in advance and could be easily targeted. An evacuation itself would be an aggressive act, potentially persuading another nuclear nation to launch a first strike. And conditions for the evacuees would be bleak and barren. Colorado's "host areas" are rural communities with harsh climates, little water, and none of the services and structures that are needed to provide for the more than one million refugees from the Denver metropolitan area alone.

Our training in public health as doctors and other health professionals teaches us that nuclear war would be the final epidem-

ic—an epidemic for which we can offer no realistic or effective medical care. Faced with such an awesome human and medical dilemma, the options are clear. There is no effective treatment; the remedy therefore must be prevention. The Denver chapter of Physicians for Social Responsibility urges the Congress to understand that the nuclear age has changed everything. What must change now is our very way of thinking. ●

TRUTH IN FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced legislation to require "truth in financial disclosure" by the Members of the U.S. Congress. Because I believe that full disclosure of personal net worth lies at the very heart of an elected official's independence and integrity, I am sponsoring legislation which will make an "open book" of the personal financial records of Members of Congress. The voters of this country who give their elected officials their trust deserve nothing less.

H.R. 6017 will do three things:

First, require Members of Congress to file their income tax forms as a matter of public record in the House and Senate; second, require random audits by the Comptroller General of the United States of congressional financial disclosure statements; and third, close loopholes in the existing Federal financial disclosure law by requiring that Members of Congress report the precise value of their holdings, as opposed to simply reporting broad and meaningless ranges of financial worth.

Mr. Speaker and my fellow colleagues, I urge you to join with me in restoring public trust in elected officials by supporting my "truth in financial disclosure" legislation. Just last year, the General Accounting Office criticized existing congressional financial disclosure practices and called for an overhaul of the system to assure the public *** "that the information contained in the public financial disclosure reports is complete and accurate." In 1980, the Congressional Quarterly pointed its finger at congressional financial statements saying they present "an open invitation for Members to conceal information." Yes, we already have an Ethics in Government Act, Mr. Speaker but we must act now to put teeth into that law, to make ethics in Government real and not illusory.

Of course, disclosure of personal worth by elected officials can be accomplished voluntarily without a new law, and some of my colleagues have done so for years. My good friend Rep-

representative PAUL SIMON of Illinois is just one very fine example of a man who has released his full financial worth for over 25 years. We need not wait for passage of Federal legislation; the Members of this House of Representatives and Senate can step forward now, take the lead and set an example by releasing their 1981 income tax returns for public scrutiny. I pledge to release my own tax statements and I ask my fellow colleagues to join with me.

As servants of the American people, we owe them the highest standards of integrity and accountability. We chose to run for public office and we sought to earn the public trust. In return, we must demonstrate that we deserve the public's vote of confidence. Reform of financial disclosure law is absolutely critical to our American political process for two important reasons. First of all, before election to positions of public trust, the voters must know where existing and potential conflicts of interest lie. Second, once elected, Congressmen must not be allowed to use public office for their own personal enrichment.

Passage of the Truth in Financial Disclosure Act will be a step in the right direction. Until such legislation becomes the law of the land, however, Members of the United States Congress must "go the extra mile" and make full and complete financial disclosure on their own.●

HEAD START PARENTS APPEAL FOR PROGRAM

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I continue to get letters from Head Start parents who both testify to the ways in which this program has dramatically improved their lives and those of their children, and express their concerns about Head Start's future. We know that Head Start works; that Head Start is cost-effective. And yet, even today, it serves only 25 percent of the eligible children, and faces substantial erosion from inflation and cutbacks in supportive services (CETA, title XX, child care food, medicaid). We need to listen to the parents of Head Start children and keep this exemplary program working. Another letter from a Head Start parent follows:

Head Start has given my children the opportunity to be with other children their age and learn so many things. They truly enjoy the classes, music, being with the other children. It has helped in so many ways. In this time it takes two parents working in order to make ends meet. The Head Start Program has given me the chance to

help my family, because, when my child is at the center, I don't have to worry about the care she is receiving. If the program were cut to four hours the child would not get as much learning time. It would really affect my job also. The greatest strength of Head Start is the attention the children receive from the instructors and all the teaching they do to teach right from wrong. To help the parents in the raising of the child I can't think of a better program than Head Start. Everything they do is for the good of the children and the good of the community.

HEAD START PARENT,
Waldson, Ark.●

RUTH HERBERT, OUTGOING PRESIDENT OF THE LOMITA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE— WOMEN'S DIVISION

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, since its inception, the women's division of the chamber of commerce in Lomita, Calif., has been a strong and positive force in the community. Earlier this year, its outgoing president, Ruth Herbert, was honored for her many contributions in 1981.

As president of the women's division, Ruth earned the highest respect of her peers and, in fact, the entire community. A graduate of the UCLA School of Nursing, Ruth moved to the city of Lomita in 1969. She immediately became very active in the civic, religious, and business affairs of her new community. Among other things, Ruth served 2 consecutive years as president of the local PTA, and was the 1980 recipient of the Lomita chamber's "Club Member of the Year" for the women's division. Also, Ruth made the time to become involved in her church activities and served as a Sunday school teacher. Ruth's dedicated service to her community, State, and country more than qualify her for this recognition.

As a nationwide community organization appealing to men and women who have the desire to become personally involved in making their cities a better place to live and work, the chamber of commerce was well suited for Ruth's qualifications and her enthusiasm.

Mr. Speaker, Ruth Herbert has demonstrated the highest competence and loyalty to the people of Lomita this past year. My wife, Lee, joins me as we proudly compliment her on a job well done. We now also offer to Ruth and her husband, Donald, and their two daughters, Heather Anne and Greta Mae, our best wishes for many more years of good fortune, continued success, and happiness in the future.●

COMPOSITION OF THE MULTI- NATIONAL PEACEKEEPING FORCE FOR THE SINAI

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the Multinational Force and Observers (MFO) is a peacekeeping force now taking up positions in the Sinai in preparation for final Israeli withdrawals from the Sinai on April 25, 1982, pursuant to the peace treaty between Israel and Egypt signed in 1979.

This important force will have 2,664 members from roughly 11 countries.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a table listing those countries participating and a letter from the Department of State dated March 22, 1982, indicating the role to be performed by the respective states providing units for the peacekeeping force.

The material follows:

Contributors to Sinai multinational force
and observers

Country and contribution:	People involved
U.S.: Light Infantry Battalion.....	808
U.S.: Logistic Support Unit.....	330
Fiji: Light Infantry Battalion.....	497
Colombia: Light Infantry Battalion.....	498
Australia and New Zealand (jointly): Ten Helicopters and their crews	124
France: Two Small Aircraft and One Cargo Plane.....	135
United Kingdom: Headquarters Staff (stenographers, file clerks, etc.).....	35
Italy: Three Minesweepers (later, hopefully, patrol boats).....	87
Netherlands: Signal Unit.....	81
Netherlands: Provost Marshal and MP's	23
Uruguay: Transportation Unit.....	73
Force Commander's Staff: In- cludes members from each par- ticipating state noted above plus four from Norway, i.e., the Force Commander and three staff officers	73
Total	2,664

¹ Plus.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington D.C., March 22, 1982.
Hon. THOMAS O'NEILL, Jr.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On behalf of the President, and in accordance with Section 3(a)(2)(A) of the Multinational Force and Observers Participation Resolution (Public Law 97-132), it is my pleasure to notify you of those countries which have recently agreed to provide military personnel for the Multinational Force and Observers (MFO).

In addition to Fiji, Colombia, Uruguay and Norway, which had previously made commitments, the MFO is concluding agreements with Australia, New Zealand, the

United Kingdom, France, Italy and the Netherlands for contributions of personnel. The contributions of the respective countries are as follows:

Norway—four persons comprising the Force Commander and three staff officers.

Uruguay—a transportation unit consisting of seventy-three people.

Colombia—a light infantry battalion consisting of four hundred and ninety-eight people.

Fiji—a light infantry battalion consisting of four hundred and ninety-seven people.

Australia and New Zealand (jointly)—ten helicopters and crews consisting of one hundred and twenty-four people.

France—two small aircraft and one cargo airplane together with thirty-five people.

United Kingdom—a headquarters company consisting of thirty-five people.

Italy—three minesweepers together with eighty-seven people.

Netherlands—a signals unit and a provost marshal and military police group together totaling 104 people.

In addition, each participating country is providing a few staff trained officers to serve on the Force Commander's staff.

Other information with regard to U.S. participation in the MFO will be transmitted to the Congress as provided for in Section 6 of the Resolution.

With cordial regards.

Sincerely,

POWELL A. MOORE,
Assistant Secretary for
Congressional Relations. ●

LOW-INCOME HOUSING NEEDS

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, the Most Reverend James Lyke, auxiliary bishop of Cleveland, Mr. Henry J. Goodman, vice president of the Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland, and Mr. Stephen Hoffman, director of social planning and research of the Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland, testified before the Housing and Community Development Subcommittee. I would like to submit excerpts from their very relevant statements for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I am Bishop James Lyke of Cleveland, Ohio. I am pleased to appear before you on behalf of the United States Catholic Conference, which is the national social action arm of the Roman Catholic Bishops.

*** The Church's concern for housing stems from the belief that each individual possesses an inherent dignity because he or she is created in the image and likeness of God. Each person should have the opportunity to grow and develop his or her potential to the fullest extent possible. This development is threatened whenever social and economic forces dehumanize or degrade people.

In this context we should not ignore the impact that poor housing has on human dignity and development. The physical and social environment play important roles in the formation and development of the

human person. We must not overlook the terrible impact that degrading and indecent living conditions have on people's perception of themselves and their future.

Poor people need decent housing which is affordable. This obviously requires an adequate supply of housing at costs within the means of low-income people. The President's Commission on Housing recently identified ten million renter households—one-fourth of whom are living in assisted housing—who require assistance if they are to live in decent housing at costs they can afford.

1. Cost of Housing.—The biggest problem for millions of low-income citizens is the financial burden of paying the rent. The poor pay a disproportionate amount of their income on housing. The median income for all renters who spent more than 35 percent of their income on rent in 1977 was only \$4,000. By contrast, 62 percent of renters with incomes of \$35,000 or more spent less than 10 percent of their income on housing. As income rises, the proportion paid for housing—particularly rental housing—decreases. Until last year federal housing programs responded to this disparity by assuring that families getting assistance pay no more than 25 percent of their income for housing. Even so, only a very small fraction of the poor benefit from housing assistance—8.1 percent of eligible households in 1978. These rising rental costs are especially burdensome on people who subsist at the poverty level and who confront rising prices and diminishing resources in meeting all of their basic necessities.

2. Housing Shortage.—Across the country there are hundreds of people waiting for decent shelter. The severe housing shortage is worst with regard to rental units. Indeed, we are gradually witnessing the disappearance of private low-rent housing. Rents in the private market are beyond the reach of low income Americans. According to the National Low Income Housing Coalition, there is a net loss of over 500,000 low rent units annually due to inflation, conversion, abandonment and other causes.

3. Preservation of Public Housing.—Public housing provides shelter for over three million people whose median income is approximately 27 percent of the national median income. In Cleveland, the local public housing authority is the landlord of 8-9 percent of the city's population (approximately 45,000 people). The average annual income per household as of December 31, 1980, was \$3,330. According to the December 31, 1981 Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority, the waiting list was 2,431 families. It is vitally important that this housing be adequately maintained. The modernization of the existing stock is an immediate concern and must be given high priority; for, unless modernization is accomplished, the operating costs associated with high energy bills and depressed maintenance will continue to rise.

IMPACT OF LAST YEAR'S BUDGET CUTS

Last year's budget cuts have intensified the shelter needs of the poor. In reports from individual bishops, from Catholic Charities agencies, from inner city pastors, from organizers of self-help programs for the poor, from housing organizers and volunteers in parishes, we in the Church have heard essentially the same message: the cuts have hurt the poor severely.

As a Catholic bishop, I have listened carefully to the suggestion that the voluntary sector, and the churches in particular, can and should take up the slack caused by the budget cuts. This suggestion, that private

charity can increase sufficiently to make key government programs unnecessary, ignores both history and reality. From a practical standpoint, it is simply not within the realm of possibility to suggest that the voluntary sector can replace major and necessary government programs. This suggestion is even more unrealistic in the area of housing. Certainly, the churches will continue to increase their efforts and resources to aid the homeless, but we cannot, by ourselves, fill the massive gap in low-income housing needs that already exists and is intensifying. While the charitable activity of religious institutions is increasing and will continue to increase, it cannot and should not substitute for the essential responsibility that government has to play in meeting basic human needs.

GOVERNMENT: ESSENTIAL ROLE

The essence of the message I would like to leave with you has to do with human rights and the role of government in guaranteeing and protecting those rights.

Pope John XXIII, in his encyclical, *Pacem in Terris*, listed the right to shelter as one of the most important of human rights. It follows directly from the right to life itself. The Catholic tradition views basic human rights as a kind of baseline, a set of material conditions which are essential for human dignity. The Church fully recognizes the significance of classifying shelter as a basic right. For rights are not matters of privilege or choice. They imply an obligation on the part of society, an obligation that ultimately rests on government.

FISCAL YEAR 1983 BUDGET CUTS

In the context of the basic principles of human rights which I have referred to, the Administration's Fiscal Year 1983 proposed reductions in the area of assisted housing are simply unacceptable. They represent a retreat from a long-standing bipartisan commitment to meeting the housing needs of the poor, and a large-scale abandonment of federal responsibility in meeting low-income housing needs. Without going into the specifics, however, let me highlight several areas of concern that I hope the Congress will consider.

I. MAINTAINING EXISTING STOCK

It is vitally important that the present stock of assisted housing be adequately maintained. The level of operating subsidies for public housing proposed by the Administration is clearly inadequate and should be increased.

II. RENT INCREASES

There should be no rent increases for the three million families living in low-income housing. The Administration's proposal to require tenants to pay their entire utility bills and to count food stamps as income could literally double or triple the rents for many households. Since rents would go up \$3.00 for every \$10.00 that the family receives in food stamps, it is the poorest tenants, those receiving maximum food stamp allotments, who would be the most severely affected. A welfare family in Mississippi or Texas living on an AFDC grant of only \$100 a month would have its rent tripled. Similarly, tenants living in cold climates or poorly insulated units would find it impossible to pay high utility bills from their meager benefits.

III. RESCISSION OF ADDITIONAL SECTION 8 AND PUBLIC HOUSING

The housing that is now in the pipeline should be produced as rapidly as possible.

The proposal to rescind funds already appropriated and thus cancel hundreds of thousands of commitments for new or substantially rehabilitated units should be rejected.

IV. SECTION 8 RENT SUBSIDIES

Federal rent subsidies in "Section 8 existing" program would be reduced by 15-20 percent under the proposed "voucher" system. This proposal should be rejected, for even under the present system based on fair market rents, half of all households receiving Section 8 certificates are unable to find units within the allotted time period.

V. RURAL HOUSING

In many rural areas the housing crisis is at least as severe, if not worse, than in urban centers. The Administration's proposal to cut Farmers Home Administration rural housing programs to one-third of their present level should be rejected. The proposed cuts would have a devastating impact on needy rural Americans, many of whom live in already substandard housing.

VI. HOUSING TAX EXPENDITURES

The burden of the proposed cuts in federal housing expenditures falls most heavily on the people who can least afford housing. Those who propose the cuts argue that low-income housing assistance programs are too costly. Yet, the largest share of federal housing activity is not in direct subsidies to the needy but rather in indirect subsidies to middle and upper income people through the tax system. Housing tax expenditures—primarily, deductions of mortgage interest and property taxes by homeowners—are rising at an unprecedented rate.

We support the goals for homeownership that the tax incentives reflect. However, the use of these tax incentives raises questions of equity which must be addressed through public policy. The people who can least afford housing must not be unfairly singled out in the reductions in federal housing programs.

We welcome "The Housing and Community Development Amendments of 1982," H.R. 5731, legislation introduced by Chairman Gonzalez. We would urge, however, that the level of low-income housing assistance be increased. The rental housing production program, in particular, should require more subsidized units for lower income households.

In closing, I wish to emphasize that the debate over housing programs, as well as the larger debate over the federal budget, is not simply a debate about numbers and dollars and programs. It is about human beings—children, parents, the elderly—their joys and sorrows, their successes and failures, their hopes and dreams. It is about American families—about whether or not they will have enough food on the table, enough income to support them, a roof over their heads. It is, in short, a debate about human dignity.

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT OF STEPHEN H. HOFFMAN

My name is Stephen Hoffman and I am the Director of Social Planning and Research of the Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland.

The availability of subsidized housing sponsored by non-profit organizations under the 202 program has made it possible for America to deal with the new realities of demographics of older persons. Twenty years ago, one tended to classify older persons needing help as over the age of 65, physically or mentally impaired, and probably des-

tinued for an institution where his needs would be met.

Because of advances in medical science, a substantial segment of the over-65 group has been spared the great health problems of the past. Their problem boils down to economics—that for them is the difference between life and death. For many, subsidized housing has become the alternative to institutionalization or deterioration. We believe that federally subsidized housing is by far the better value—socially and economically.

A major positive aspect of the economics of subsidized housing is often overlooked. This housing undoubtedly delays, and often avoids, institutionalization in nursing homes. The average per capita subsidy at our subsidized buildings is approximately \$5,000 to \$6,000 a year. However, if these people had no alternative but to live in a home for the aged, and were supported by the Medicaid program, the same subsidy provided for them could cost between \$18,000 and \$20,000 a year. Where this develops, the savings to the government is probably at least \$13,000 per person annually.

Our experience in Cleveland in this regard has been gained through the operation of two programs in our system of services. One building is called Council Gardens, run by the National Council of Jewish Women. It has 130 suites and was built under the original Section 202 low-interest loan program. An addition was recently opened under the present program. The average age of the person living there is 82. Ten percent are over 90. While everyone is able to function independently, a few residents have some moderate disabilities. There are programs with meals and social activities, as well as shopping assistance and the availability of a nurse for emergencies.

Our newest building is called the R. H. Myers Apartments. It is affiliated with one of our homes for the aged, Menorah Park. The average age of residents here is 81-and-a-half. All residents are able to live independently, although there are many with significant disabilities.

We have no doubt that many of the residents in the R. H. Myers Apartments would be in homes for the aged if this building and services did not exist. Let me cite a couple of examples of people who have been helped through these programs.

At Council Gardens there is a resident who has lost two legs to diabetes. He is being supported on SSI. Before moving to Council Gardens, he lived in an old house with a bathroom on the second floor, where he had to crawl upstairs to toilet himself. Now he lives in a special handicapped suite, in a barrier-free building. He is able to come and go as he pleases, cook for himself, and engage in activities. Services provided at Council Gardens and through our system of services, plus the subsidy from the Section 202/8 program, have made a world of difference to this person.

Another woman at Council Gardens is 39 years old and handicapped. As a child she was autistic and she did not speak for 20 years before moving into Council Gardens. She had been living in an illegally converted third-floor room in an old house in a Cleveland suburb. Since moving to Council Gardens, she has begun to speak again and is now working in a sheltered workshop sponsored by a local vocational agency. She regularly attends programs at the Jewish Community Center and interacts, along with her fellow tenants, with the more than 3,800 senior adults who make use of the activities

there from week to week. Council Gardens is next door to our Jewish Community Center. The residents there, as well as other senior adults, have the opportunity to swim, to engage in discussion groups, craft programs, and similar activities that add purpose to their lives. No one has to feel they are locked in and must stare at four walls. Similar programs are offered to the residents of the R. H. Myers Apartments for the non-subsidized as well as the subsidized suites.

At Council Gardens the average income of the tenant is \$428 a month, or \$5,136 a year. The 202 program enables the tenant there to have a safe, clean, dignified environment at a cost that doesn't destroy them.

We did a survey three years ago that indicated that over 1,000 Jewish persons are known to be in need of and qualified for subsidized housing, in addition to those who currently live in a subsidized facility. We, therefore, created Jewish Community Housing, a nonprofit corporation, to help stimulate more subsidized housing, and received a HUD loan to build 100 units now under construction. But the need continues. Council Gardens has a waiting list of 240 people. The R. H. Myers Apartments has a waiting list of 300, for its 42 subsidized units, and over 100 for its market rate units at a time when the regular market in Cleveland is experiencing vacancies.

The Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority, our public housing authority in Greater Cleveland, has 7,000 suites in 25 buildings for older persons, with a waiting list of over 1,400 people. Here, too, the waits are for years. In suburban Cleveland alone, there are 3,800 elderly on waiting lists for various subsidized buildings, even though 2,100 suites have been built in Cuyahoga County during the last four years. Yet, under the plans projected by the administration, there will be only 325 new suites available for the entire State of Ohio, in the face of the need for thousands.

Nationally, the picture is very similar. Today:

One in every nine Americans is over the age of 65, and this will grow to one in eight by the year 2000.

Thirty-eight percent of the population is over the age of 75, and by the year 2000 they will represent nearly one out of two older persons.

The income of older Americans is about half that of the under-65 population, and elderly Americans are disproportionately represented among those that are in need of federally-assisted housing. More of them are poor and thus unable to afford suitable private housing. Elderly poor are often in worse economic straits than the non-elderly poor, partly because they are less able to find work to augment their inadequate income. Further, the elderly are more likely to have expenses for health problems.

We believe that the Section 202 Program is an important way for the government and our country to respond to these needs. It is also a way for the government and the private sector to work together to improve the quality of life of older persons.

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT OF HENRY J. GOODMAN

My name is Henry Goodman and I am a volunteer leader of the Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland of which I am vice-president.

The Jewish Community Federation of Cleveland is over 78 years old.

The Federation and its agencies have been engaged in a variety of housing programs over the last 20 years. We administer congregate living facilities for older persons and have made use of Section 236 and 202 programs in the past. We also have been involved in an intensive effort to revitalize and stabilize an integrated suburban community and to help preserve the housing stock there. Our work there is known as the Heights Area Project. It is involved in a neighborhood of Cleveland Heights, a suburb of Cleveland, Ohio. Over the last 11 years, we have provided private funds to make possible \$640,000 in loans, which have enabled 208 families to purchase homes valued in today's market at close to \$9 million.

The Federation and its agencies operate on revenues derived from private contributors, fees for service, and government funds. I believe that our programs represent one of the best examples of the way in which the government and the private sector have been able to work together to accomplish more for people than either could accomplish alone.●

A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION ACT, THE POULTRY PRODUCTS INSPECTION ACT, AND THE EGG PRODUCTS INSPECTION ACT

HON. WILLIAM C. WAMPLER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, today I am joined by Congressman HAGEDORN in introducing legislation forwarded to the Speaker by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (Executive Communication No. 3857) which would modify the Federal Meat, Poultry, and Egg Product Inspection Acts to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the intensity of inspection provided to individual processing plants. The bill applies only to processing operation—not slaughter operations.

Neither I nor Congressman HAGEDORN endorse this measure in its entirety or without qualification. We do, however, believe that circumstances in the meat, poultry, and egg processing plants have changed sufficiently that the concept of continuous inspection can be modified to some degree. Federal budgetary constraints now and into the future require us to look at just such a measure as this.

On the other hand, there are several issues raised by the changes proposed in this legislation that should be addressed in the hearings that hopefully will be held promptly to consider this important measure. Among other things, the Members will want to hear from industry and others regarding the amount of discretion the Secretary should have, and the plants should have, in determining whether and under what conditions certain establishments should be placed in a "non-

continuous" inspection category. The Members will want to examine whether the standards of "total quality control" in meat, poultry, and egg processing plants are adequately set forth in the legislation and are not vague and ambiguous for those who will be subject to the act. In addition, the Members no doubt will wish to know what type of legend will appear on the label that will not receive the continuous inspection that is currently in effect.

Finally, Members, of course, will wish to have as much information as possible about the results of the pilot program of "voluntary total quality control" that currently is in effect.

Under current laws, USDA administers inplant, daily inspection programs which are designed to assure that consumers receive wholesome, unadulterated meat, poultry and egg products and that these products are properly marked, packaged, and labeled. In addition, the Department also administers periodic inspection under the shell portion of the Egg Products Inspection Act. This act requires that all shell egg handlers packing eggs for the ultimate consumer be inspected at least once each calendar quarter to assure that eggs which are not fit for human consumption are being destroyed or diverted to nonhuman food use.

Federal involvement in meat inspection began with the Meat Inspection Act of 1890 when concern was raised over the wholesomeness of livestock and the sanitary conditions under which meat products were prepared. Most processing operations consisted largely of cutting, boning, and rendering within the same plant where the animals were slaughtered. Subsequent refinements in the law were enacted in the Meat Inspection Act of 1906 and the Wholesome Meat Act of 1967. The Poultry Products Inspection Act of 1957, the Wholesome Products Act of 1968, and the Egg Products Inspection Act of 1970 brought all poultry products under mandatory inspection.

As a result of the conditions which existed when these initial inspection laws were passed, it was determined that an intensive inspection system was required. Thus, the legislation called for "continuous" inspection—the onsite, daily presence of inspectors in slaughter and processing plants.

Since then, changes in volume, advanced technology, and industry competition have brought about a significant evolution in the nature and type of meat products prepared and marketed. As such, processing has become a separate operation from slaughter.

To accommodate these changes, manufacturers have modernized their plants and implemented their own quality control systems. In turn, USDA has designed new quality control methods to match industry's progress in processing meat products.

In August 1980, the Food Safety and Inspection Service authorized a voluntary quality control system for meat and poultry processing plants. Presently, 48 plants are under voluntary total quality control and another 30 are in the approval process. Over half of the 48 plants are small to midsize establishments producing 10 million pounds or less annually.

In my own State of Virginia, two plants, one which prepares sandwich products and another which processes turkeys into various products have recently been approved for the total quality control program pilot project. A third plant is in the final stages of approval for such pilot project.

Mr. Speaker, the bill I am introducing will give the Secretary increased discretion to determine the degree of inspection that should be provided to processing plants. It would authorize the Secretary to use a series of uniform steps to determine, on an individual plant basis, whether something less than continuous inspection would achieve legislative standards for inspection. The criteria that follow would be used as a tool to gauge a plant's capability of and dedication to monitoring its own production processes necessary to allow for less-than-continuous inspection. The criteria include: The type of product produced and the establishment's frequency of operation; the establishment's product monitoring system and its reliability; and its compliance history.

The greater discretionary authority would allow USDA to maintain or increase surveillance at those operations that require it and allocate inspection resources to other plants as needed.

Small plants that are not participating in the voluntary total quality inspection programs would not be penalized under this bill. USDA provides technical expertise to small plants. In addition, USDA-approved voluntary "partial" quality control programs and inplant quality programs are also available. Most plants already have some sort of a control program in place and the type and volume of product produced and the complexity and frequency of the processing operations affect the scope of quality control needed over the process.

The proposed legislation changes the current inspection legend from "inspected and passed" to "Prepared in a USDA inspected establishment". USDA feels that the sheer increase in volume of processed products has shifted the focus of meat and poultry inspection away from the product and to the process by which it is produced.

Finally, the bill would reduce the number of required visits to egg-breaking operations from four to one per year. Technological innovations in egg-breaking operations and product

control systems have made less intensive inspections feasible.

The legislation is expected to reduce the FSIS budget expenditures by \$2 million in 1983 and up to \$26 million by 1989. Total program costs have doubled over the past decade and costs of processed product inspections have almost tripled—increasing from \$25 million in 1970 to more than \$71 million in 1980.

USDA has estimated that the number of processing inspectors would be reduced from 2,215 to 1,077 between 1983 and 1989. However, this would be accomplished by normal attrition and reassignment of inspectors to slaughter positions.

As I understand it, the American Meat Institute, the National Broiler Council, the Poultry and Egg Institute, the National Canners Association, the National Turkey Federation, and other trade groups have endorsed the "concept" of the proposal. However, they may, or will as the case may be, seek changes in the bill to make it acceptable to their membership.

I believe the bill has considerable merit and that hearings should be held to consider any changes that could be made in the legislation to accommodate all interested parties.

I would hope that Members will take time to comment on this legislation and advise either Congressman HAGEDORN or myself whether they believe it has merit and support.●

ROGER BACON BASKETBALL TEAM—AAA CHAMPS

HON. THOMAS A. LUKEN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. LUKEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to what I believe to be a significant occasion for some young people in my district. Recently, the Roger Bacon High School basketball team won the AAA championship of the State of Ohio. The work that went into obtaining this title was indeed great and I would like to give both the team and the coaching staff the recognition they deserve.

This is the first time in its 54-year history that Roger Bacon has brought the State title back to Cincinnati. In 60 years of tournament competition, this is only the third time that the championship has been won by a Cincinnati team. I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the spirit, enthusiasm, talent, and determination which have made Roger Bacon High School the best in the State of Ohio.

Under the professional direction of Head Coach Bob Callahan, the Spartan basketball team has compiled a season record of 24 and 4. In advancing through the season competition,

the Spartan team has faced, and upset some of the best basketball teams in the State.

The future is bright for players on the Roger Bacon team. To achieve such success requires commitment and competitive drive which will stay with these young people as they move into their future academic and athletic careers. I would ask all of my colleagues to join me in extending our warmest best wishes to the Roger Bacon basketball team, Father Jim Bok, principal, Coach Bob Callahan, and also the student body for their enthusiastic support.

The following people comprise the winning team for the State of Ohio and it was a job well done: Nick Bierman, Adrian Breen, Bill Chambers, Dave Eha, Don Hausfeld, Carl Johnson, Bruce Knolle, Logan Link, Mike Morrissey, Rob Niehoff, Rick Sander, and Greg Schildmeyer.●

SUPPORT OF FUNDING MYCOPLASMA RESEARCH TOWARD THE CAUSE OF ARTHRITIS

HON. BERKLEY BEDELL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. BEDELL. Mr. Speaker, several of my constituents have written to me recently with personal testimonies to an arthritis treatment they have received from a noted physician who has spent the last 30 years in our Nation's Capital, Dr. Thomas McPherson Brown.

After having some correspondence with Dr. Brown, I had the opportunity this week to have him testify as my guest before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare. Dr. Brown is the director of the Arthritis Institute at the National Orthopedic and Rehabilitation Hospital in Arlington, Va., where he heads a team of researchers dedicated to the treatment of arthritis. I requested Dr. Brown to testify to tell of his research and of the importance of funds to continue his work. I am honored to share with you Dr. Brown's testimony and am confident you will find it informative.

The statement follows:

TESTIMONY OF THOMAS MCPHERSON BROWN, M.D.

I appreciate the honor of being invited to testify on behalf of the arthritis problem and the major needs for funding at the national level. I am Dr. Thomas McPherson Brown, Director of the Arthritis Institute of the National Hospital for Orthopaedics and Rehabilitation and former Chairman of the Department of Medicine at George Washington University where I served for 21 years.

The Arthritis Institute was founded in 1970 to continue a research objective we initiated 40 years ago. In 1949 at the 7th Inter-

national Congress of Rheumatology we presented data which suggested that rheumatoid disease was due to an intermediate type virus-like microorganism known today as mycoplasma. At that time we realized the elusive nature of this newly recognized microorganism. We were also aware of the likelihood that years of research would be needed to develop techniques to reveal its presence and clarify its relationship to the disease. Over the years there have been only occasional periods of interest by others which served to delay research in this direction.

In 1972, however, an encouraging investigation was reported before this same appropriations committee. At that time Dr. Whedon, Director of the National Institutes of Arthritis, Metabolic and Digestive Diseases, cited a research study being carried out at the National Institutes of Health in swine which showed that mycoplasma induced a form of arthritis similar to that seen in man. On the basis of this work he stated "Heartening progress is being made to determine the cause of rheumatoid arthritis".

In the same year a Blue Ribbon Committee of prominent rheumatologists stated "It is unlikely we will be able to develop a generally effective treatment either for prevention or cure of the disease until the mechanism is clearly understood". The committee recommended "one of the most important lines of further study in arthritis research should be directed toward the identification of a possible viral or other infectious agent as the cause of arthritis." Despite these important statements, 10 years have passed again with minimal interest and research support directed towards the infectious cause. Recently there has been a resurgence of interest sparked by a report in *The New England Journal of Medicine* by two prominent microbiologists. They stated, "Not only is the mycoplasma hypothesis regarding rheumatoid arthritis possible it even seems to be more plausible."

At the present time major interest is being focused upon complexity of the immune mechanism. This direction appears to be taking us further away from the cause of the disease and the practical needs of the patient. In the clinical sense many patients are caught in a cross fire of drug uncertainty. On one hand the extraordinary toxicity of many standard arthritis remedies requires the utmost care by highly trained rheumatologists. On the other hand, in the vast rural areas of our country where there are no arthritis specialists available, most information the patients receive is negative with emphasis on avoiding quackery and unproven remedies.

They are told to be suspicious of special diets, vitamins, food supplements and the like which were proclaimed useful not so long ago by those same experts who declared rheumatoid arthritis to be primarily a metabolic disorder. It would appear that the authorities who have dictated policy over the past 35 years are themselves standing on shifting sands of uncertainty and there is a need for a consistent positive therapeutic direction based upon the cause of the disease.

The renewed interest in a virus approach to the rheumatoid process is congruent to our own investigative effort which has been pursued for nearly half a century. The most important aspect of this therapeutic program today, as it was in 1949, is our demonstration that sustained control of the disease is possible. With more than 30 years of

experience we have found the treatment program we have evolved to be safe and less expensive than the standard empirical approach. We have also found it possible to treat all patients early in the disease wherever they might live. We have already begun two outreach programs in rural areas and they are highly effective and successful, modeled after our own center.

In two recent reports, one at the 15th International Congress of Rheumatology in Paris and the other at an International Symposium at the University of Arkansas, we described the use of the antimycoplasma approach in a series of totally disabled patients who were referred to us after seven years of standard therapy. They had all become totally unresponsive to treatment and had reached the point of "no return." These patients had been told by experts that nothing more could be done for them. The crucial test of the effectiveness of our program was demonstrated by the good response of this group of patients to our treatment plan over the subsequent five years. On this basic program these patients gained an average of 70% improvement and are still holding this gain.

These findings open the door for a new era of treatment directed toward an infectious cause. Success, however, in this new direction is dependent upon the specificity of the therapeutic design tailored to the individual patient.

Parenthetically, it should also be noted that many substances used empirically to treat arthritis over the years such as gold salts, quinine derivatives, even copper salts and bee venom all have a specific effect against mycoplasma. These findings add further support to the validity of the concept upon which this program rests.

In treatment, we have found certain safe antibiotics with specific antimycoplasma action. They must be used correctly to be effective, namely, to be given intermittently in low dosages and for a sufficiently long period to suppress mycoplasma toxin formation in conjunction with properly acceptable anti-inflammatory drugs. Reported negative results by others can be clearly traced to failure to conform to these precise therapeutic principals which we have described in publications over the years as essential for success.

In view of the substantial evidence supporting the mycoplasma etiology and the great practical need in directing treatment for the patients, I would strongly recommend that the committee give due consideration to special funding for extensive mycoplasma clinical research. Sufficient funds should be designated to enable at least three mycoplasma centers to conduct extensive clinical studies over a minimum five year period. The type of support should provide the necessary time for a properly qualified team of immunologists, microbiologists, biochemists and clinicians to reach significant conclusions without the pressures usually encountered in short term research where the concept of "publish or perish" often prevails.

I wish to thank the committee once again for the opportunity to present a plan of attack which places the patients' needs in the forefront and utilizes the most fundamental type of basic research to meet these needs throughout our land.●

SHIFTING WELFARE COSTS LACKS LOGIC AND MORALITY

HON. WILLIAM H. GRAY, III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, the residents of my home city of Philadelphia remain deeply concerned about the economic and budgetary policies of the present administration. They are particularly concerned that the administration's policies ask far too great a sacrifice from the elderly, the handicapped, the poor—particularly the working poor—and those who live in our inner city, urban neighborhoods.

In an effort to bring to the attention of my colleagues the depth of this concern, Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD the following article from the Philadelphia Daily News of February 26, 1982. It is a commentary by Msgr. S. J. Adamo, and eloquently addresses the serious flaw in the administration's proposal to shift welfare costs from the Federal Government to the States:

[From the Philadelphia Daily News, Feb. 26, 1982]

SIMPLY STATED, SHIFTING WELFARE IS IMMORAL

(By Msgr. S. J. Adamo)

There is incredible irony in President Reagan's determination to transfer welfare programs to the 50 sovereign states. The irony lies in the fact that the Reagan administration claims to be deeply concerned about improving the moral climate of America. His White House, consequently, is the darling of the Moral Majority.

All this is ironic because the shift of welfare grants from Washington to the states is really an abdication of brotherhood, the fountainhead of morality. Today, the federal government is telling people it will no longer be their brothers' keeper; someone else will have to take care of the needy, if they wish to do so.

Of course, the excuse given is that Reagan wants to decentralize the government, to restore local autonomy, to re-establish federalism. This is a smokescreen to conceal the fact that Reaganomics has little concern for the poor. After all, why doesn't he return health care and education and Medicare to the states also? Why just welfare grants and food stamps? It is so arbitrary.

It is also immoral.

The care of the poor is a religious duty that rests on everyone. It is one of the oldest and most enduring precepts of the Scriptures. From the earliest times, men have been instructed by the prophets: "You shall not harden your heart nor close your hand to him in his need." (Deuteronomy 15:7) And after Christ's coming, the Apostle John wrote: "How can God's love survive in a man who has enough of this world's goods, yet closes his heart to his brother when he sees him in need." Clearly, then, generosity toward the needy is central to our Judeo-Christian morality.

Yet Washington is forsaking the poor while uttering solemn pieties about its trust in God.

What difference does it make whether the federal or state government or private agencies provide for the needy? The difference is equity. The reason that Washington got involved in welfare provisions was the disparity in the provisions made by various states. Some were generous and compassionate; others were tight-fisted. The federal agencies were established to equalize help programs. In fact, Washington worked hand-in-hand with state agencies, providing more help for the poorer states and less for the wealthier ones.

Now this partnership is threatened. If Reagan's plan succeeds, the states will be on their own. If that happens, the poor will get less and less during an inflationary economy in which they need more and more simply to stay at levels already reached.

Misery is spreading throughout the land even before Washington abdicates its welfare role. Apparently the recent reductions in food stamps for the poor, as well as hot lunches for school children, have had a disastrous impact on countless Americans. Check with almost any food program run by a private agency and you will find out that the number of people coming for free meals is increasing daily. In some cases, mothers and children are eating at soup kitchens originally set up to care for bums and hobos and drifters.

It's a replay of the worst days of the Great Depression a half-century ago. But at that time, our government had neither the will nor the means to cope with the sudden economic collapse. Now it has the means but not the will.

Nor is the economy in a state of collapse; billions that should have gone to social programs for the betterment of the poor and middle class now have gone to building a monstrous war machine unlike any ever created in peacetime! Unconcerned about the growing misery throughout America, the Reagan administration wants to reduce welfare programs further. Handing them over to the states is a hypocritical way of achieving that aim without being blamed for it. But then, what can one expect from an administration that provides weapons and economic aid to governments that murder and torture their own people?

Any government that is immoral is not going to worry about people being ill-fed, ill-housed and ill-clothed. Indeed, they'll forget any and all problems as they dine on their thousand-dollar place settings in the White House.●

INDICTMENT: THE CASE AGAINST THE REAGAN ENVIRONMENTAL RECORD

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, 10 organizations which work diligently and continuously to protect our environment issued a condemnation of the current administration—"Indictment: The Case Against the Reagan Environmental Record." These groups (Friends of the Earth, Natural Resources Defense Council, the Wilderness Society, Sierra Club, National Au-

dubon Society, Environmental Defense Fund, Environmental Policy Center, Environmental Action, Defenders of Wildlife, and Solar Lobby) have banded together to draw an accurate and distressing picture of the Reagan administration's attack on clean air, clean water, hazardous wastes, toxics, national parks and many other resources which it is the Government's responsibility to protect for this and future generations.

It is particularly appropriate that this indictment has been issued during malicious attacks by the Reagan administration, industry, and some Members on the Clean Air Act and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. Industry and those in Government who believe that the self-interest of particular businesses takes precedence over the public interest are deliberately attempting to destroy some of the most important protections of our health and safety.

Tuesday, the full Energy and Commerce Committee began consideration of a bill to amend the Clean Air Act which would, if adopted, substantially destroy any hope we have of improving our air quality in the foreseeable future. Therefore, at this time, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the parts of the indictment relating to clean air and regulatory reform.

The article follows:

POLLUTION CONTROL

A dozen years ago there was no national program to protect the public from the hazards of pollution. The federal laws that were on the books were weak and ineffective, and pollution was getting worse. The problem could be seen, felt, tasted, and smelled. Scientific evidence of the seriousness of environmental degradation mounted. Human health, basic biological systems, recreation, and the natural beauty of our land and waters were being destroyed.

The American public decided to put a stop to it. They demanded action and over the ensuing decade the Congress responded, passing by overwhelming, bipartisan votes a series of strong and innovative laws mandating federal action to protect the nation from poisons in the air, in the water, and on the land. Among the statutes enacted by Congress were:

Statute:	Year passed
Clean Air Act	1970
Clean Water Act	1972
Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act	1972
Marine Resources, Research, and Sanctuaries Act	1972
Safe Drinking Water Act	1974
Solid Waste Disposal Act	1976
Toxic Substances Control Act	1976
Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act	1977
Superfund	1980

These statutes were not the results of a brief fad or legislative caprice. They were major legislative initiatives enacted as a result of intense public concern with real problems that cause injury, sickness, death, and material devastation.

All of these laws, except for the Surface Mining Act, which is administered by the

Office of Surface Mining in the Department of Interior, are the responsibility of the Environmental Protection Agency. EPA has been devastated by budget cuts. OSM staff is being decimated. Both agencies have cut back sharply on enforcement and drastically weakened regulations. Neither is doing the job Congress told it to do.

AIR POLLUTION

The Clean Air Act, our flagship environmental law, is under attack. The Reagan Administration's legislative proposals, regulatory changes, and budget actions are crippling the nation's clean air program. They threaten to bring back an era of dangerous, damaging, dirty air.

PREAMBLE

Air pollution can kill people and make them ill; it attacks the natural environment; it destroys property. Air pollution of various kinds causes or aggravates cancer, emphysema, bronchitis, heart disease, and other diseases. Acid rain destroys lakes and forests. Ozone causes billions of dollars in crop damage.

The clean air legislation passed a dozen years ago and strengthened five years ago requires EPA, with the help of the states, to clean up our air. For a decade there was progress. A start has been made on controlling pollution from automobiles, powerplants, smelters, refineries, and scores of other sources.

But enormous tasks remain: ensuring that existing nationwide health standards are met; regulating highly toxic pollutants, such as benzene and arsenic, that are still uncontrolled; controlling acid rain, and inspecting existing controls to ensure that they continue to work.

CHARGES

Instead of tackling these tasks, the Administration has marched backwards, abandoning the goal of clean air.

Weakening National Clean Air Standards.—The Administration has proposed or supported amendments that would emasculate the Clean Air Act, has dragged its feet on issuing regulations the law requires, and has abolished or watered down existing regulations. Specifically, the Administration has called for amendments to the law that would:

Weaken health standards to cover only so-called "significant risks." This means abandoning protection of specially sensitive groups such as children, the elderly, people with heart and lung disease, and others. The Congress has already blocked this attack of health standards.

Allow deadlines for attaining the air quality standards that protect the public health to slip from 1982 and 1987 to as late as 1993. Weaken auto emissions standards to allow more than a doubling of nitrogen oxide and carbon monoxide emissions—a change that would expose millions of people in as many as 16 major urban areas to continued unhealthy air.

Cripple the requirement that new cars must meet emission standards before they are sold and the provisions for recall when they do not.

Do away with requirements that, in polluted areas, new sources of pollution (such as powerplants, refineries, chemical plants) use the most effective pollution controls available.

Repeal protection for areas with air that is still clean, thus allowing new polluters to locate there and use less than the most effective pollution control technology.

Drastically weaken the carrot-and-stick provisions by which the federal government

encourages states to adopt effective pollution control plans. Conscientious states that adopt good plans would be at the mercy of industries which threaten to move to states having weaker controls.

Allow greatly increased pollution of the air in National Parks and wilderness areas.

While mounting this assault on the law itself, EPA has taken administrative action to undo existing clean air requirements and has failed to issue long-overdue regulations. Some of these changes are subtle but far-reaching. For example, the Clean Air Act program to meet health standards in polluted areas depends on review by the states of proposals to build new industrial sources of pollution. Illegally redefining the word "source," EPA has effectively exempted most new polluting industrial installations from state reviews.

EPA has also:

Proposed to weaken by up to 5 times heavy truck emission standards, even though the National Commission on Air Quality found that emissions from heavy trucks must be controlled if we are to meet national health standards for air quality.

Proposed to weaken the automobile emissions standard for hydrocarbons to permit an increase of approximately 25 percent in hydrocarbon emissions (one of the constituents of photochemical smog).

Proposed to weaken particulate emissions standards for diesel automobiles, the fastest growing and least controlled part of the automobile fleet.

Failed to develop a particulate standard for diesel trucks.

Failed to set required standards for industrial boilers and the most dangerous fine particulates.

The Administration has even proposed a retreat in control of lead, a pollutant which is especially dangerous to children. EPA itself has sponsored recent research which shows that even extremely low blood levels of lead affect the brain patterns of young children. Yet EPA has:

Developed proposals to allow increased use of lead in gasoline, thereby increasing human exposure, most significantly the exposure of inner city children. These proposals reverse a longstanding policy of the federal government to protect the health of the nation's children by reducing lead in the environment.

Failing to Act on Toxic Air Pollution.—The Reagan Administration's failure to move on toxic air pollution is especially threatening to millions of Americans who live in the shadow of chemical plants, coke ovens, and other factories which emit chemicals that can cause cancer and other deadly diseases. Recent research indicates that as much as 10 to 20 percent of lung cancer is due to air pollution. According to EPA, more than 300 plants in 39 states and territories emit large amounts of unregulated chemicals that are known or suspected to cause cancer or other serious diseases. Yet, after years of study, EPA has:

Failed to act on a list of 37 pollutants which threaten severe hazards to human health.

Cut the budget for action on toxic air pollutants so sharply that it may be more than a decade before action on all these chemicals is even begun.

Failing to Act on Acid Rain.—From West Virginia to Maine, aquatic life in lakes and streams is dying. Thousands of lakes in Minnesota alone are in jeopardy, and hundreds are dead as sulfur from industrial stacks creates acid precipitation. In many states, acid

rain is blamed for damaging forests and farmland and eroding buildings. Acid rain is a disaster that is real and growing.

The Reagan Administration claims that more study is needed before acting to control acid rain. The Administration opposes strengthening the Clean Air Act to mandate control measures. The Administration even seeks to weaken controls in current law limiting sulphur emissions from new plants. Even the words "acid rain" are out of fashion at EPA: Mrs. Gorsuch prefers the expression "non-buffered precipitation."

The Reagan Administration wants changes in the Clean Air Act to:

Exempt new large industrial coal-fired boilers from requirements that assure that a minimum percentage of sulfur oxides are removed from their emissions.

Allow extensions of deadlines for meeting sulfur dioxide standards, which would allow delays and relaxations until 1993.

The Reagan Administration is also, by administrative action, changing the sulfur emission levels allowed from existing sources. It has:

Increased authorized sulfur dioxide emissions by 1.5 million tons a year, a very significant amount. Nationwide SO₂ emissions are currently 29 million tons per year.

The Administration has also undone a requirement proposed two years ago that powerplants with tall smoke stacks must reduce their SO₂ emissions by 412,000 tons per year. Now, EPA:

Is requiring a reduction of only 166,800 tons per year of SO₂ emissions from powerplants with tall stacks. Since present SO₂ emissions from tall stacks are over 500,000 tons per year, this means that more than 333,000 tons will still be contributing to acid rain in states and nations downwind of the powerplants.

Although the Reagan Administration has provided extra funds for acid rain research (\$22 million for FY 1983, up \$12 million over FY 1982), the addition may have a fatal drawback if research is simply being "accelerated" for a 5-year study, instead of the 10-year study originally planned by EPA. Many of the most serious effects of acid rain do not show up in the first 5 years.

Decreasing Enforcement.—EPA has reduced the credibility and effectiveness of the entire regulatory program by a sudden and radical decrease in enforcement actions.

After a series of jolting reorganizations and sharp budget cuts, the cases filed in federal court have declined almost 75 percent since Mrs. Gorsuch took office.

Gorsuch personally undercut enforcement when she agreed in a private meeting with corporate officials to look the other way when Thriftway Refiners violated the Clean Air Act by increasing the amount of lead they put in their gasoline.

Reducing Research and Monitoring.—Budget cuts proposed by the Reagan Administration will cripple research for air programs. Overall, the Reagan budget for FY 1983 proposes cuts of 23 percent from the level of two years ago in air quality. Specifically, the Reagan Administration budget would:

Eliminate human epidemiological research on the health effects of air pollution.

Cut clinical research on health effects by 50 percent, eliminating investigation of volatile organic chemicals.

Cut research on hazardous air pollutants severely. The Agency will look at three hazardous pollutants in 1983. At that rate, it will take a decade to examine the list of substances deemed priority because of their threat to human health.

The budget for monitoring air programs and assisting states has also been drastically cut. The proposed Reagan budget for FY 1983 would:

Cut back by 40 percent monitoring of air quality to determine the levels and kinds of pollution already present in our air.

Cut grants and technical assistance to state air programs by 30 percent, thus crippling state efforts to implement clean air requirements.

REGULATORY REFORM

Under the cloak of "reform", the Reagan Administration is carrying out a program to eliminate protection of the public and participation by the public in the formation of environmental policy through regulation.

PREAMBLE

There is little economic incentive for industry to control pollution. The "free market" does nothing to protect wilderness or wildlife. It is only through governmental action that we have reduced pollution, created national parks, controlled the ravages of stripmining and, in general, sought to protect the quality of our lives. Much of what government does is accomplished by setting rules for private behavior. The Congress, in laws enacted to protect human health and the environment, has required federal agencies to make such rules.

CHARGES

Under the Reagan Administration, "Regulatory Reform" is a euphemism. In practice, it has come to mean reduced opportunities for public participation in policy making, increased opportunities for industry participation in government decisions, delayed action on many rules that are essential to protect the environment, health and safety, and increased emphasis on reducing costs to industry even where the result is increased risk for the public.

Putting Economics Ahead of Health and Safety.—Shortly after he came to office, President Reagan issued Executive Order 12291. That order allows the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to review regulations both before they are proposed and again before they are promulgated, to order review of existing regulations, to delay regulations, and to require increased consideration of industry objections regarding the cost of a regulation. OMB has fulfilled its mandate with enthusiasm and a notable disregard for the human and environmental consequences of its actions. OMB is a budgetary agency. It has no environmental, safety, or health expertise.

OMB has exercised its authority over dozens of environmental regulations. The result has been suspension of pre-treatment regulations for industrial effluents, suspension of insurance regulations for hazardous waste handlers, and delay in the labeling of toxic substances in the workplace.

Deeming itself exempt from the fairness and openness requirements applicable to other agencies, OMB has operated in secret and served as a special conduit for private industry contacts.

Excluding the Public.—Throughout the Government, public access to information has been reduced. The Administration has proposed to cut back on the Freedom of Information Act, and agencies have already cut back on information they voluntarily disclose. The pattern is particularly obvious in the environmental area. Congress wrote unique and broad ranging public participation requirements into the environmental laws, because those laws are designed to pro-

tect the public. The Administration seems to regard public participation as an obstacle to smooth relations with industry.

Secretary Watt has proposed to reduce opportunities for members of the public to participate in decisions on leasing, land use, strip mining, and wilderness.

EPA Chief of Staff Daniel has recommended a sweeping revision of EPA public participation policies to reduce public access.

The Agriculture Department has proposed revisions to land management planning regulations for the Forest Service which substantially reduce requirements for public notice and opportunities for public comment in the planning process.

The Agriculture Department also withheld from the public, and finally released only under pressure, unfavorable comments on its soil conservation program.

EPA has destroyed hundreds of publications designed to provide information on pollution.

EPA has imposed severe constraints on the publication by its scientists of research results and scientific data.

The Administration's Regulatory Reform program seems to operate from the assumption that the public has little business interfering with government and that industry should not be required to reduce the level of environmental pollution, cancer-producing food additives, dangerous and defective products, or workplace hazards unless the public can prove that the economic value of health, safety, and environmental protection exceeds their cost to industry. ●

EQUITY AND BALANCE

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, this week the steering committee of the group of members from the Northeast and Midwest known informally as the Gypsy Moths had an opportunity to testify before the Budget Committee during its review of proposals affecting the fiscal year 1983 budget. Among those testifying were FRANK HORTON, CLAUDINE SCHNEIDER, TOM TAUKE, and LARRY DENARDIS, who appeared along with Cochairman BILL GREEN and myself as chairman.

A number of our colleagues and others have asked to receive copies of our prepared statement. Accordingly, I thought it might be valuable to have the text entered into the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, we thank you for the opportunity to testify in behalf of our group of Republicans from the northeast and midwest, known informally as the "Gypsy Moths." The program we will present today has been approved by our Steering Committee Members, who have put in countless hours trying to fashion budget proposals which will be fair to our region and which can attract significant support in the Congress. We on the Steering Committee have talked individually with Members of our full group and have their backing here today. Never in our memory have the difficulties in putting to-

gether a federal budget been greater than they are this year. More than ever, the process requires an atmosphere of close cooperation, careful deliberation, and meaningful compromise. Yet, the longer it takes, the more difficult that task becomes.

We recognize that the President and his Administration have taken on some very tough questions and have produced a bold set of proposals. We want to commend you, Mr. Chairman, and others of your colleagues on this Committee who have reached out in the spirit of conciliation and compromise in an effort to make the changes in the proposed budget that are necessary for its approval and effective implementation.

Our primary message can be summed up easily with the words "equity" and "balance." If the fiscal year 1983 budget is to address our nation's problems effectively, it must demonstrate equity and balance in at least three ways: (1) by region, (2) by program, and (3) by its effects on individuals and groups. Let us look at each of these areas in a bit more detail.

Regional Implications.—No area of the country has a monopoly on economic distress; however, there seems to be no question that a major portion of the current economic downturn is centered in the older industrial states of the Northeast and Midwest. Unemployment rates in January ranged from 16 percent in Michigan and 11.8 percent in Pennsylvania to just 4.6 percent in Wyoming and 5.9 percent in Texas. Experts predict that this trend will continue even while other regions of the country are expected to recover more quickly if the economy picks up later this year.

We strongly believe that it is in the nation's best interest to take advantage of our region's vast infrastructure and industrial base, including its array of skilled workers, research facilities and educational institutions. Common sense dictates that rather than allowing continued deterioration of these valuable resources, to be accompanied by higher and higher unemployment costs and welfare benefits, we should take determined, targeted actions to preserve and improve them in a manner that will result in meaningful and productive jobs in the private sector—jobs that will provide goods and services to a weak economy; revenues to strapped state and local governments; and hope to weary workers and their families.

The first step would be to maximize use and improve implementation of existing programs such as tax credits for rehabilitation of existing structures, hiring the chronically unemployed, and introducing new research and development activities. Next, we must seriously tackle the tough questions involved in developing a truly effective, jobs oriented federal policy for education, training and retraining. Finally, the private and public sectors must work together in a quest for more creative efforts than past programs have provided. We should look at such steps as modernizing the St. Lawrence Seaway, developing coal ports on the eastern seaboard, using pension funds for investments in housing and community development, providing incentives to develop goods for export, and freeing small businesses from unreasonable constraints.

America's strength stems in no small part from the fact that its various regions are parts of a single, economic whole. They are dependent on one another, each offering unique contributions and special resources the others lack. Federal policy works best when it encourages this positive relation-

ship, while remaining sensitive to the varying fiscal and economic considerations of different states and localities.

For decades, the federal government has invested billions of dollars in laying the foundations for economic revival in the south and development of the west. Enormous outlays have been made for water and energy projects, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, military bases, rural electrification, port construction, the space program and scores of others. However, as economic decline accelerates in the north-east and midwest, federal policy not only remains tilted toward development interests of the south and west, but changes are being made that actually exacerbate the situation. For example, the 18 states of the northeast and midwest receive only about 84 cents in value for every dollar they send to Washington through taxes. Meanwhile, the cuts being made in domestic programs fall most heavily on our region, while the increases in defense are headed more toward the south and west.

Programmatic Relationships.—While approximately \$40 billion in domestic programs were cut last year, the same degree of scrutiny has not been given to military spending. The General Accounting Office, Republican and Democratic study committees, and many others have outlined billions of dollars in specific savings that could be made without adversely affecting national security. Looking for savings in this way can work only to focus greater attention on the best methods for achieving a truly effective defense, while at the same time enhancing the strength of the nation through an equally strong economy.

Another programmatic relationship about which we are deeply concerned involves that between financial investment and investment in people (what many have called "human capital"). 1981 was the year of expanding financial capital so as to assist business in providing the structures, machinery and other hardware needed for economic recovery. This year should be the year of expanding our commitment to the needs of developing the economic skills of people—development of "human capital." To do this we need to ensure an adequate number of qualified people to operate the machinery and provide efficient management, administration and other needed services. This can be done only through meaningful education, training and retraining at the elementary, secondary and postsecondary levels in close cooperation with the private sector. Congress has already pared education and training programs to their minimum, and we need to give greater attention to this issue during the balance of the 97th Congress.

Effects on Individuals and Groups.—Meanwhile, we should not allow any single type of individual or group to bear a disproportionate share of the burden. For example, we cannot forget the special needs of senior citizens, minorities, women and the poor. Our group continues to be committed to such programs as Medicaid, Social Security, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, and others, as well as to their more effective management.

At the same time, states, localities and private enterprise do not have the capabilities to take over federal responsibilities instantly, without commensurate sources of new revenues. It is especially true in our region, where tax efforts are at their limits and businesses are struggling to survive. This can be exemplified by such actions as cutting back on Medicare or Medicaid without

ensuring alternative steps to see that health care costs are met or reduced.

We recognize that the role of your Committee is not one of deciding either the structure or funding level of specific programs, and we do not intend to delve into a level of detail which would mire us in debate over line item numbers. That is not the purpose of a budget resolution, and it would be inappropriate for us to address programs in that degree of specificity at this time or in this forum. We will be working within the various authorization committees and appropriations subcommittees during the weeks ahead with that intent. Indeed, we will shortly be releasing a package of more specific program recommendations which we will take to the various authorizing committees. Rather, at this time we would like to present for your consideration a broader outlook on the budget and give you a number of recommendations relating to three major components of the First Budget Resolution you are trying to fashion: (1) savings in defense, water projects, agricultural subsidies and international affairs, (2) domestic discretionary programs, and (3) revenues.

Defense.—Last year our group proposed a \$9 billion reduction in the President's FY '82 defense proposal and voted for the Roukema amendment for an across-the-board reduction. We simply are unwilling to exempt defense from the same scrutiny Congress is giving other programs. Members as diverse as the Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Chairman of the House Appropriations Defense panel have agreed that the 20% increase in defense budget authority called for by the Administration for FY 1983 must be pared. In addition to looking for the waste and abuse we mentioned earlier, hard decisions should be made on specific programs, so as to help deal with the serious deficits projected for future years.

We suggest that the current request could undermine our long-term defense both economically and politically. We must assess realistically the threat we face from the Soviets (and we have no doubt that it is real) and balance that against the threat we face from inflation, interest rates and unemployment. High interest rates could damage the defense industry by drying up credit for plant modernization and by making it nearly impossible for skilled workers to move to new jobs.

We also warn this Committee and the Administration that insisting on this surge of military spending now undermines political support for a reasonable improvement of our defense posture over the long run.

Consequently, we recommend to this Committee a reduction of the President's defense proposal of at least \$12-15 billion in outlays from what the President projects. We would also like Congress to give serious consideration to placing a maximum cap of 5% real growth in defense for 1983 over the current year. We recognize that the resulting reduction in budget authority is not necessarily going to result in huge reductions in outlays in 1983, but it will have a significant impact on future outlays, and we emphasize the importance of addressing the enormous deficits projected for the out years. We have let our manpower and readiness fall into disrepair in recent years and, thus, we will be recommending that these areas of operations and maintenance take priority over exotic hardware within defense budget planning.

Water Projects.—We are not naive about the political problems inherent in our traditional approach to legislation dealing with water projects. However, our group feels strongly that Congress is long overdue in showing the political courage necessary to attack water projects which are very expensive, have grossly inaccurate cost/benefit ratios, and in all too many instances threaten the environment. We think it is reasonable for this Committee to reduce the President's request for Function 300 by \$450 million to reflect reductions in these projects. Again, we will be going to the Public Works and Appropriations Committees with detailed recommendations about which specific programs we are slating for elimination.

Agricultural subsidies.—Gypsy Moths are also concerned about the level of government subsidy to certain agricultural producers. While we recognize the significant merit of some agricultural programs, we do seriously question the reasonableness of others. Many of these subsidies are inflationary, they hurt the consumer, and they run counter to current efforts generally in the government to rely more heavily on private enterprise and the market system. We are especially concerned about government programs for tobacco, sugar, and peanuts.

International affairs.—We are willing to go along with the Administration on most international financial programs and economic assistance. However, we would cut the increase in concessional foreign military sales by \$500 million, which would still leave a 60% increase. This is sufficient to continue funding of concessional sales to Israel and Egypt and to provide \$339 million for discretionary use in support of foreign policy.

Domestic discretionary programs.—This is the area where most of the cuts were made last year. We cannot go back to the well here again, because there simply is not enough water. It comprises less than 6 percent of the total budget—somewhat over \$40 billion—less than half of the most optimistic deficit projection for FY '83.

Yet, some of our most vital programs fall into this category. In addition to the "human capital" programs mentioned earlier, we would like to stress our commitment to energy, economic development, education, Medicaid, transportation, and several other areas vital to our region.

When it comes to energy, our region receives a "double whammy." While our long winters and cold temperatures require us to pay out billions of dollars in fuel costs, the producing states are reaping windfalls from both profits and taxes. With decontrol of oil prices, our region was promised adequate low income energy assistance, along with weatherization and other conservation programs to cut further fuel needs and costs. Now these programs are being cut, while increased severance taxes and the specter of natural gas decontrol lie on the horizon.

As we stressed earlier, effective economic development programs are clearly both a national and regional need. While our greatest numbers of jobless workers are in states such as Michigan, Indiana and Ohio, by the end of last year significant areas of unemployment were outside our region. Now is not the time to cut back, but to maintain efforts aimed at job creation and retention.

Revenues.—Finally, in order to address the deficit effectively, we recommend revenue increases of at least \$25 to \$30 billion. Our group is perfectly willing to look at the President's proposals and give them serious consideration, but we also have an extensive additional list of options that we have devel-

oped and about which we will be talking to the Leadership and the Ways and Means Committee at the appropriate time.

We can indicate now, however, that we will recommend repealing the "mistakes" made during the "bidding war" on the landmark tax bill last year, plugging "loopholes," and considering other changes that meet our criteria of equity and balance. For example, we would revoke the special advantages given the oil industry in the 1981 tax bill, repeal expensing of intangible drilling costs and accelerate elimination of depletion allowances. We would substitute a negative investment tax credit for the present practice of "selling" credits, tighten up the minimum tax for corporations and consider a number of excise tax changes.

During consideration of any of the difficult decisions we face in the weeks ahead, we feel it is essential to proceed in a bipartisan manner and to avoid pitting one region of the country against another. Although all of us, of course, must be concerned for the well-being of our regions, we must face our national responsibilities. In that connection, we share the concern of others at the proposed size of the deficit and its implications as to inflation and the crowding out of private sector access to financing. We want to take this opportunity to express our willingness to work with others to address these issues, even as we work to address the needs of our region.

Accordingly, we make these recommendations in the spirit of cooperation, deliberation and compromise that is needed to meet effectively our many problems. We pledge our time and best efforts in helping shape a budget that reflects that spirit.●

H.R. 6007—WEATHER MODIFICATION POLICY ACT

HON. JIM SANTINI

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. SANTINI. Mr. Speaker, this week Congressman Brown, myself, and several concerned western Congressmen have introduced the Weather Modification Act of 1982. I believe weather modification is an up-and-coming, not to mention much-needed, technology. It is, to date, the most promising source of new water supply in the Colorado River Basin area. In dry regions of the Eastern United States, it is an answer to many of our agricultural problems.

As a cosponsor of the Weather Modification Research, Development, and Policy Act of 1982, I would like to stress the important advantages this bill provides for those of us in the arid, thirsty West.

No. 1: It will increase our very limited water supply by generating better and greater water supplies.

No. 2: It will greatly improve water quality.

No. 3: It will increase hydroelectric power generation, which is of great significance in these energy-conscious times.

In addition, weather modification has the possibility of greatly benefiting agriculture as well as avoiding weather disruption and damage, the need for which can be easily witnessed by the detrimental events of the past winter seen in all parts of our country.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) stressed the need for weather modification in its 1979 report stating that:

Congress should set forth a national weather modification research and development policy and direct that a program be developed with goals, objectives, priorities, and milestones.

Our Weather Modification Policy Act of 1982 provides this unified policy. It prescribes the needed inter-agency coordination plan necessary to make weather modification the effective technological tool it is capable of being.

Legislation of this same nature has been considered by previous Congresses but action is long overdue to meet our goal of establishing a national weather modification policy. It is clear that strong support for this needed legislation exists. We must now finish what we have begun, and finally make a national weather modification policy a reality.

I urge my House colleagues to join with me in this technologically sound, economically efficient endeavor to improve water supply and quality throughout the Nation. The Weather Modification Act of 1982 deserves your serious consideration and support.●

TOURISM IS BIG BUSINESS

HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the course of debating the budget over the coming weeks, there will be serious attention given to many ways to cut spending. It is important, however, in these deliberations that contemplated budget reductions are not counterproductive. That is a concern of the Congressional Travel and Tourism Caucus on which I serve as vice chairman.

Tourism is a big business in America and around the world. While the success of campaigns to encourage tourism will always rest on the dedication and entrepreneurship of the private sector, there is a Federal role to coordinate and promote travel to the United States as a whole. The Federal Government has recognized that responsibility, and it was that recognition which led to the passage of the National Tourism Policy Act. The fiscal year 1983 budget proposal for the implementation of that act is now being considered in committee and I

hope will be increased over the initial request, which was inadequate in light of this Federal recognition.

As the tourism industry begins to gear up for the peak travel seasons, there are some facts that I would like to put before this body that relate to the industry in my home State of California. These facts were provided to me by the California Hotel and Motel Association, which is the largest organization of its kind in America. I am grateful to the association's president, John McKennon, and their executive vice president, Edwin Sloan, for bringing this information to my attention.

When we speak of travel and tourism, we are talking about a trip of at least 100 miles that involves a minimum of 1 night away from home. Within those simple parameters, travel and tourism in California is now a \$25.4 billion industry. Tourism is the No. 1 industry in California. California now leads the Nation in domestic travel and tourism receipts with 15 percent of the total.

Everyone in this Chamber represents people, jobs, and small business that depend on travel and tourism. It is not just the metropolitan centers or the national parks or the resorts that benefit from tourism. In fact, tourism means money for every county. In the California counties of Mono, Alpine, Mariposa, El Dorado, and Sierra, tourist dollars have a greater relative value than they do in Los Angeles or San Francisco.

We hear from State leaders of the urgency to increase their State revenue resources, especially in the context of the New Federalism. We should not overlook the tremendous contribution of tourism to our State coffers. Tourism in California in 1980 generated \$842 million for State government. An additional \$371 million was generated in sales and property taxes for county and municipal governments, including \$129 million in hotel and motel room taxes alone.

Tourism is also a labor-intensive industry, which is all important to note when we are facing high jobless rates. In California hotels and motels during fiscal year 1981, there was an average of 11,016 jobs provided by the industry, with a payroll of \$913,635,000. That does not even include the related food service industry located outside hotels and motels, which is in itself a \$1.42 billion industry. In addition to jobs directly within the industry, another 577,700 California jobs are related to and supported by the travel and tourism industry.

Fortunately, the tourism industry is growing. While other major industries in California are facing difficult economic times—agriculture, auto production, and construction—travel and tourism continues to be comparatively healthy. Obviously, any Federal expenditure which goes toward increas-

ing travel and tourism can be considered an investment in a healthy economy.

Besides insuring adequate funding for the implementation of the National Tourism Policy Act, there are other things that we in this Congress can do to foster growth in the industry. We can look to reducing visa requirements for nonimmigrant visitors, as the administration has proposed and supports. We can facilitate the entry of international visitors by proper coordination and staffing of the inspections services at international airports. We can prepare now to welcome foreign visitors to planned international events such as the 1984 Los Angeles Olympics.

Mr. Speaker, there are many ways the Congress can encourage and promote the tourism industry for America. I am proud of the many achievements that have been made in California and the example it has set for all States in fostering the development of travel and tourism.●

NATIONAL DAY OF REFLECTION

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, Sunday will be the National Day of Reflection as proclaimed by Congress. I would like to thank my colleagues from New York, Mr. KEMP, and Mr. ROSENTHAL, for sponsoring this resolution.

The National Day of Reflection is designed to recognize the basic contribution of ethical values and principles to the well-being of our society. The National Day of Reflection also acknowledges the 80th birthday of the distinguished leader of the Lubavitch movement, Rabbi Menachem Mendel Schneerson, who is a resident of my district. Rabbi Schneerson has dedicated his life to the promotion of basic ethical values and principles, particularly among young people. I am extremely pleased that Congress has honored Rabbi Schneerson.

As the joint resolution which we passed this week states, "Society is presently concerned with the weakening of these principles that has resulted in crises that beleaguer and threaten the fabric of civilized society." We would certainly be better off today if the Members of this House were guided less by short-term political expedience and more by the ethical values which have been stated through the years by Rabbi Schneerson and other spiritual leaders.●

DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL SUPPLY CENTER CELEBRATES 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHARLES F. DOUGHERTY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. DOUGHERTY. Mr. Speaker, April 1 marks the 20th anniversary of the Defense Industrial Supply Center (DISC) and its mission of supply support to the Nation's Armed Forces.

Established as a field activity of the Defense Logistics Agency on April 1, 1962, DISC has for two decades, combined professional personnel talent with modern management techniques to provide its military customers throughout the world with responsive logistic support. DISC items are used by all the services in support of their multimillion-dollar weapon systems such as the Black Hawk and Huey Cobra helicopters, the Stratofortress, F-15, F-16, F-18, and E-3A (AWACS) aircraft, the M-60, and M-1 tanks, the Trident submarine and Poseidon missile, as well as the repair and overhaul of other military and space program equipment, including America's Space Shuttle.

In addition to supplying vital parts to our Armed Forces, DISC also provides emergency support in times of disaster. A 300-foot oil barge carrying over 2.8 million gallons of heavy fuel oil was grounded on a sandbar on the New Jersey coast and DISC arranged same-day truck pick up and delivery of 4 reels of 4-inch circumference nylon line for use by the Coast Guard to extricate the barge which had begun to leak.

Another emergency request was received from Norway for helicopter cable assemblies for air-sea rescue work in conjunction with the collapse of a North Sea oil drilling rig. DISC also provided emergency service to the U.S.S. *Midway* when it was involved in a collision, furnished life-saving material for the Mount St. Helen's rescue mission, and supplied 2-inch circumference nylon line used for towing refugee boats floundering in the Florida Straits.

Commanded by Brig. Gen. Rano E. Lueker, USAF, DISC averages over 16,000 individual sales each calendar day of the year, with a catalog of over 780,000 industrial items. The DISC inventory totals nearly \$600 million, with sales of over \$466 million per year.

From its headquarters in northeast Philadelphia, DISC personnel maintain a constant flow of critical items 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to satisfy the supply needs of the military services.

Nearly 2,000 career civil servants and 33 officer logisticians representing each of the services, are responsible for the realization of DISC's mission. Because of the primary functions relating to procurement, supply, distribution, and technical analysis, the majority of employees are in the inventory manager, purchasing agent, and equipment specialist categories.

DISC, during its 20 years of service, has been responsible for the wholesale support of the military services with industrial type items. These include bearings, block and tackle, rigging and slings, rope, cable, hardware, metal bars, sheets and shapes, and electrical wire and cable.

DISC catalogs over 31 percent of the total DLA number of items with many items enjoying repetitive demand and high dollar sales characteristics. The center processes nearly 6 million requisitions yearly and renders bills to over 9,000 customers.

DISC has met the challenges of its first two decades squarely and surely. Its personnel now look forward to the future by continuing its role as a vital link in DLA's logistic chain from American industry to the U.S. Armed Forces through improved support at reduced costs.

As DISC completes its second decade of service, I personally extend my praise and appreciation to Brig. Gen. Rano E. Lueker, USAF, his officers and civilian personnel who have not only given so much to the successful accomplishment of their military mission but have also pioneered numerous and innovative community services programs in the Greater Philadelphia area.

The people of Philadelphia and the Nation can take justifiable pride in a fine job well done and to look forward to the continuation of DISC's vital role in the defense efforts of our country. ●

H.R. 5922

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5922, the urgent supplemental appropriations bill now under consideration by the House contains badly needed funds for a number of important programs. One of the programs which I believe to be most essential to the future of this Nation, and which is most urgently in need of additional funds, is the guaranteed student loan program.

As my colleagues know, the bill now before us will provide \$1.3 billion in supplemental funding for student loan insurance. This amount exceeds President Reagan's supplemental request

by \$321 million. The President's request, however, assumed the enactment of legislation which would severely restrict participation in the higher education loan programs. Without the savings generated by these changes, money for the guaranteed student loan program will be exhausted in April.

It appears unlikely to me, Mr. Chairman, that Congress will make further changes in the guaranteed student loan program in the current fiscal year. I certainly could not support additional changes, coming as they would on the heels of the modifications contained in last year's reconciliation bill. Many of the reductions made by that legislation in the Federal student assistance program were in my judgment unwise, and I would hope that at some point in the not too distant future the Congress will reconsider them.

The recognition of the fact that the guaranteed student loan program needs additional funds to operate for the remainder of the fiscal year makes it incumbent upon us to provide those funds. Millions of young Americans look to this program to make possible their obtaining a college education. They are the future of this country and our investment in their education is an investment in that future. Attempts to reduce or eliminate student assistance programs may generate budget savings, but those savings will produce the worst kind of false economy. To successfully compete with other nations in the high technology environment of the next century, the United States will require as high a level of education among its citizens as possible. We only shortchange this country later by attempting to shortchange student aid programs now. I am not prepared to take that course and would hope that a majority of my colleagues are similarly inclined.

Passage of H.R. 5922 will demonstrate the support of this House for the student assistance programs. I urge my colleagues to express that support and give our young people a sign that Congress shares their determination to obtain as much education as their abilities allow. ●

AN ANALYSIS OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, America's international trading position is a matter of increasing concern to Congress. More and more of our Members are addressing the issues of free trade, protectionism, reciprocity, nontariff trade barriers, and quotas. Many legis-

lative alternatives have been put forth, some directed toward specific problems whereas others are more general in scope.

During these times of economic problems here at home, we must recognize and take advantage of the opportunities in the worldwide marketplace. At the same time, we must not lose sight of the basic point: It is the private sector of our economy, and our individual businessmen and women, who must function in whatever sort of economic environment that results from our actions.

At the recent convention of the Cast Metals Federation (CMF), international trade issues were examined in detail by the assembled delegates. My constituent, Albert Gruer, presented a thoughtful analysis of both the opportunities and the problems of doing business overseas. As he told his fellow delegates, the globe is shrinking in size and interdependence is growing. The American business community cannot isolate itself from this, but is going to have to learn how to compete in this new environment.

I believe that the points made by Mr. Gruer help to place into appropriate context the international trade issues that may be voted upon by Congress this year. I feel that this analysis will help all of us to obtain a fuller comprehension of what needs to be done so as to benefit our Nation's business community. I, therefore, commend the following speech to the attention of my colleagues.

AN ANALYSIS ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE DELIVERED TO THE CAST METALS FEDERATION BY ALBERT GRUER

On July 8, 1981, Ambassador Bill Brock, our U.S. Trade Representative, made a statement on U.S. trade policy before a joint Senate committee. From his remarks I quote:

"The U.S. is more dependent on international trade than at any time in recent history. Exports generate real income and new jobs, and imports increase consumer choice and competition in a wide range of goods and services.

"We are not only being increasingly challenged by the ability of other countries to produce highly competitive products but also by the growing intervention in economic affairs on the part of governments in many such countries. We should be prepared to accept the competitive challenge and strongly oppose trade distorting interventions by other governments.

"We will strongly resist protectionist pressures . . . while pursuing policies aimed at the achievement of open trade and the reduction of trade distortions and adhering to the principal of reciprocity in our trading relations.

"A high priority will be assigned to the reduction or elimination of domestic disincentives. Confusing, contradictory, and unnecessary complex laws and regulations adversely affect exports.

"While making more effective use of the Government's export promotion resources, the Department of Commerce is assigning a high priority to strengthening the foreign

commerce services and improving export information efforts.

"U.S. agreements with our trade partners are predicated on the fact that trade must be a two-way street in a genuinely open trading system * * *. The administration will strictly enforce U.S. laws and international agreements relating to international trade, and specifically, our antidumping, countervailing duty, and similar structures are designed to neutralize or eliminate trade distortive practices * * *. In this regard, 'We will need full and active support from the private sector in identifying compliance problems and in seeking solutions.'

"Our policies toward adjustment will take into account the fact that economic vitality of certain sectors of our domestic economy is clearly essential to the national security. Where other nations have a natural competitive advantage, U.S. industry must either find a way to upgrade its own capabilities or shift its other resources to other activities * * *." However, "Where the foreign advantage is based on government subsidies and other trade-distorting practices, U.S. policy will be to enforce U.S. trade laws and to work to eliminate such practices * * *." In this regard, "It is U.S. policy to place primary reliance on market forces to facilitate adjustment in affected industries. Import restrictions, subsidies to domestic industries, and other market distorting measures should be avoided. A better solution to the problems associated with shifts in competitiveness is to promote positive adjustment of economies by permitting market forces to operate."

Ladies and gentlemen, our position paper printed in the folders that you will be delivering to your Congressmen and Senators, is the CMF position on international trade. We essentially agree with the position taken by the administration. However, in CMF's position, we have noted specifically some areas that are related to the casting industry which should be of interest to our Senators and Congressmen. I suggest that you read it closely and discuss it as an important issue when you meet with your Congressmen and Senators during your visit here to Washington. If you do not see them and you leave the position papers at their office, or write them, make sure that you emphasize the importance of our position on international trade.

There is no question that international trade is becoming a subject of much attention in many industries today. It is not only affecting the cast metals industry but affects many other industries as well.

In this regard and as a result of its importance to us today and tomorrow, we have attempted to restructure the international trade committee by dividing it into two subcommittees. One is the export trade promotion committee with Tom Gutbrod of motor castings as the subcommittee chairman. The prime objective of this committee is to find out and disseminate to the members of CMF (and possibly to each of the trade associations of which we are comprised) those methods that should be used in trying to export castings. This would not only involve the dissemination of information on the "how-to", but also would bring to the attention of members those hurdles that must be overcome in the export of castings, such as duties, taxes, nationalistic tendencies, export restrictions, quotas, etc. Also because exporting is an area in which most of us have not participated, it certainly will involve a high degree of risk.

The other subcommittee is the fair trade subcommittee which is chaired by Bill

Burke of Vulcan Foundry. The Fair Trade Subcommittee was set up to review trade practices as they relate to casting imports. Should the committee determine that a specific country or bloc of countries is violating trade agreements or treaties or is otherwise engaged in unfair trade practices, the committee would investigate these actions and recommend what remedial action should be taken by the industry consistent with the objectives of CMF.

If the recommended action is accepted by the CMF board, then that segment of the industry affected would be notified. Should producers of that segment wish to take remedial action, they would be asked for a funding commitment which would be collected in the name of the CMF Fair Trade Subcommittee and specifically segregated for the purpose of that action.

Should unfair trade practices of any foreign country or block of countries be such that they affect the entire foundry industry then the CMF board could commit CMF funds to support remedial action. At this point in time as you are all well aware, the producers of manhole castings and construction castings have been the most active participants in the fair trade subcommittee. They have organized themselves; have singled-out their product line; have their own committee within the subcommittee; have raised their own funds for labor action—even had one individual member foundry bring suit—and have information necessary to go to battle!

In the jobbing area, it's a little more difficult to be specific about the casting product line, but we all know we're being hurt directly and indirectly. Thus, I call upon you to become involved in the committee of international trade. Perhaps each State should have one representative from their State to participate on this committee.

We have several means of bringing to our attention unfair trade practices: 1. You could write to Bill Burke who is chairman of the subcommittee. 2. Likewise you could bring all of this to the attention of Walter Kiplinger. 3. You could funnel it through your state committees. 4. And in addition, bring it to the attention of Federal and State legislators, the Department of Commerce, etc.

I would be the first to admit that the subject of international trade is most complex and complicated and somewhat difficult to measure in absolute terms or statistics. We all have more than a gut feeling that it is adversely affecting us in a serious way in today's marketplace.

We have proposed to the CMF board that action be taken to try and define the size of the import market as it affects the casting industry. (Something we can really grab-hold of.) It has been stated by many that it can't be done. But we feel we can get a better handle on it even if some estimates have to be made. Kip has been working with some of our trade associations in trying to define this better and I am hoping that by our next meeting we will have more definite information.

I am sure many of you read much more than I do, but I have noticed more and more articles and news publications about the impact of foreign countries upon our U.S. economy. Let me cite just a few:

October 13, 1981, Wall Street Journal headlines: "Steel producers in Europe to cut exports to U.S.—move follows threat of trade war by American industry over surge in shipments."

At an annual conference of the International Iron and Steel Institute, U.S. produc-

ers aren't losing any opportunities to hand out warnings. U.S. companies have threatened legal action to curb shipments that they call unfairly priced and heavily subsidized.

A short time later in the Milwaukee Journal headlines: "Seven U.S. Steelmakers File Scores of Unfair Trade Suits Against European Steel Companies, Straining Already Weakened Trade Relations With the European Economic Community."

The suits accuse foreign producers of dumping or selling steel in the United States at prices below the cost of production.

October 20, 1981, in our newsletter from CMF—it stated that the GAO of the United States recommends that the Commerce and Defense Departments give the foundry industry more attention because of its importance to defense needs. Because of its importance to defense needs in addition to the number of foundries going out of business. The GAO report to the Secretary of Commerce states "We are concerned over trends in foundry closures and their impact on foundry capacity. Two possible explanations for these trends are the impact of Federal regulations and increasing imports."

December 23, 1981, Wall Street Journal headlines: "Nuts and Bolts—Ever-Rising Imports of Machinery and Parts Raise Fears in the U.S.—Besides Trade and Job Issues, Some Fret About Effect on the Defense Industry."

Just a few significant notes from that article—"Almost every valve used in the renovation of Standard Oil Co. of California's refinery near Pascagoula, Miss., was imported from Canada, Japan, or Europe—imports don't stop with cars and steel. Many of the Nation's other big industrial concerns increasingly turn to foreign manufacturers when they want to buy machinery, castings, valves, fasteners or any of a myriad of other 'nuts and bolts.' One half of the Nation's carbon steel valves are imported. In 1965 the United States exported 5 times more machine tools than it imported. In 1980 imports were nearly twice as much as exports * * *."

December 14, 1981, Business America: An article by Richard Barovick, contributing editor, on the multilateral trade negotiations adopted in mid-1979. The article states that Mr. Raymond J. Waldmann, Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Economic Policy, recently told Congress there were three major ways of viewing our trade negotiations:

"The surveillance of other countries' activities in the trade sphere is the first and critical step in ensuring that U.S. rights are protected. * * *"

"Enforcement of U.S. rights under the six non-tariff measure codes adopted in the MTN is closely related to the surveillance activities. While experience with enforcement has been limited thus far, the Commerce Department has been actively encouraging U.S. firms to come forward with their problems in foreign government policies and rules * * *"

"Taking advantage of the multilateral trade negotiations agreement requires growing awareness by the U.S. business community of the availability of the codes and their benefits. An extensive public education program has been developed, but as Waldmann put it, 'much remains to be done in this area' * * *"

Also, in Business America—December 14, 1981, headlines: "Under Secretary Olmer Warns of U.S.-Japan Trade Imbalance."

He states in this article that the trade situation in autos and auto parts between Japan and the U.S. is symptomatic of the larger problem in our trade relationship with Japan—that is, the enormous U.S. trade imbalance with Japan which this year will exceed \$15 billion, and might be \$50 billion by 1990 if the trends aren't changed. It was Mr. Olmer's opinion that these staggering trade deficits with Japan are in general not the result of lack of competitiveness of U.S. products; nor caused by strong U.S. dollars or high U.S. interest rates; nor is it caused by U.S. apathy in developing the Japanese market. "As a matter of fact, the U.S. has a substantial 34 percent of the Japanese import of manufactured products, but the problem is that Japan does not import much in the way of manufactured products." He goes on to say that the fundamental reason for Japan's surplus is a profound inequality in our access to the Japanese economy, and this inequality is caused by a longstanding Japanese policy and practice which encourages exports and discriminates against imports.

On a recent trip to Japan by Secretary Baldrige and Under Secretary Olmer, they conveyed to the Prime Minister of Japan and other leaders of Japan the following points:

1. The imbalance is becoming a political issue which threatens to affect our total relationship.

2. We do not seek to redress the imbalance through restrictions on Japanese imports, but rather through an expansion of U.S. exports.

3. The administration and Congress are equally concerned and united in their insistence on effective Japanese measures.

4. Finally, and most importantly, the time for talks is over. The time for action on the part of Japan is now.

Iron Age—January 22, 1982, there appeared a short article which I am sure most of you had read headlines: "Foundries Find the Recession Cramping Their Capacity."

After going through the entire article as to the woes that face us, near the end an important comment is made: "The dark horse in foundry plans for the rest of the 1980's, whether they are captive or strictly a jobber, is trying to measure the impact of import competition."

The Wall Street Journal—January 26, 1982, headlines: "At a Crossroads—Japan Nears a Choice of Easing Trade Curbs or Facing West's Ire—Protectionist Pressure Rises, but the Japanese Criticize Failings of U.S., Europe."

In this article it is mentioned that the United States has listed 51 separate tariff and non-tariff barriers which include import quotas; and that they also include restrictive standards and inspection requirements that effectively shut out such American exports as cosmetics, food additives, autos, tobacco, medical supplies, semiconductors, and high-technology products.

American Metal Market—January 27, 1982, headlines: "Soft Outlook in Japan Could Pressure Exports"

This article is saying that despite rosier projections from the Japanese Government, most private think-tanks here expect another dull year for Japan's economy which could mean persistent pressures for continued high levels of export growth.

And I would like to bring to your attention one more situation. It is an article that appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel on January 21, 1982, an article by Peter F. Drucker, taken from Industry Week. The

title was "G.M.-Suzuki structure seen as a new multinational model". The article states: "The most significant *** event in global business last year was the acquisition by General Motors of a 5.3-percent interest in Japan's Suzuki Motor Co., Ltd."

"It suggests the kind of multinational arrangement that will dominate the business world of the future."

"The multinational of tomorrow will be comprised of autonomous partners, linked in a confederation rather than through common ownership," Drucker wrote.

"It will be shaped very much like the GM-Suzuki structure. It will integrate the labor resources of the Third World, where a tremendous number of workers are desperately in need of jobs, with the purchasing power of the developed countries."

"The new multinational will be held together by management and marketing," Drucker said. "No one unit will be the 'parent company'. No one will control. The relationship is one of mutual dependence rather than domination or subordination." "Suzuki's top management does not 'report' to GM even though Suzuki is a dwarf next to GM. And if its plans work, GM by 1980 will have become as dependent on Suzuki as a supplier as Suzuki will be dependent on GM as a customer." And then, Peter Drucker goes on to say, "GM did not buy Suzuki to sell cars, but to buy cars. The plan involves the purchase by GM during the 1980's of up to 800,000 minicars designed jointly by the two companies and built largely in automated Suzuki plants in Japan or in Suzuki-managed plants in the labor surplus countries of Southeast Asia, with distribution through GM dealers worldwide."

However, I need to remind you that many companies in the U.S. have much invested beyond the shores of America. They depend upon these foreign assets and facilities for their economic growth, and often for a supply of materials, parts, or manufactured items that are imported into America.

We feel in our committee that much of the attention in the past in the Cast Materials Federation has been placed on our domestic problems such as energy, OSHA, environment (clean air and water; and hazardous waste), EPA, regulatory reform, tax legislation and capital formation, etc. That is all well and good. We are proud to see that emphasis on these domestic problems have been effective in getting much of what we need or desire. It isn't until recently perhaps that we have begun to think about international trade and how it might be affecting us and probably irritating us! Thus the need for more participation from more of our members in our international trade committee. I am sure that each of you could play a part in helping us to be more effective in this area.

It must also appear to all of us that we all have a profound job ahead of us not only in managing our business and in structuring our manufacturing and marketing efforts insofar as our domestic trade is concerned, but also we are beginning to realize that the world is becoming broader in its interrelationships and very complex, and the globe is shrinking in size and interdependence is growing.●

SLOVENIAN SOCIETY HOME OF EUCLID, OHIO, HONORS JOHN AND TILLIE EVATZ

HON. DENNIS E. ECKART

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. ECKART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of Congress the commendable efforts of John and Tillie Evatz. Their selfless contributions to their community and their country have recently been recognized by the Slovenian Society Home in Euclid, Ohio.

The contributions of John and Tillie Evatz and the Slovenian Society Home have enriched our country with the culture and heritage of the Slovenian people. One need not look very far to see the contributions of the Slovenian people to our community and our country. Their culture, music, and dramatic and social arts are an indelible part of our society. They enrich our country with their vitality, their heritage, and their patriotism.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the Slovenian Society Home and our Nation in honoring John and Tillie Evatz and to commend their efforts and those of the Slovenian community.●

ACCESS TO POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

HON. ALBERT LEE SMITH, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. SMITH of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today my Access to Postsecondary Education Act, an alternative to other proposals for the guaranteed student loan program (GSL). My plan will save American taxpayers \$3.5 billion in Federal outlays by 1987, while preserving access to postsecondary education for graduate students excluded from eligibility under other plans.

There is no question that there have been abuses in the GSL program. Taxpayers must not be required to fund low-interest loans for students who do not need them, for those who invest these Federal funds for personal profit, and for students not making satisfactory academic progress. At the same time, we must preserve access to higher education for capable students who want to better themselves, but who cannot afford to without Federal loan guarantees.

Most important, my plan returns the program to its original purpose: Insuring that only those who need loans will get loans. The Access to Postsec-

ondary Education Act also narrows the substantial gap between the Federal cost of borrowing and the return on Government loans. It removes incentives for abuse by investors. The act reduces the effect through which the Federal Government gobbles up available credit needed by businesses, industries, and individuals for economic recovery. Further, my bill requires that students with small loans pay them back quickly, while preserving the full payment time for those who need to borrow substantial amounts to complete their education. Finally, my bill avoids abuse by students who fail to meet institutional requirements and who are terminated for academic non-performance.

America's greatest resource is the ability of our young people to compete in the world market for high technology. It is clearly in our national interests to preserve graduate student eligibility in the GSL program and to correct program abuses. I call upon my distinguished colleagues in the House to join me today in assuring access to postsecondary opportunity while saving billions of hard-earned tax dollars.●

**CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL—
SOLOMON ALBER**

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, I am again honored to join my colleagues in our "Call to Conscience" vigil, the congressional effort to draw attention to the plight of the Soviet Jews. I commend Congressman LENT for organizing this demonstration of congressional concern for the victims of Soviet oppression.

Today I voice my concern for one courageous individual, Prof. Solomon Alber, whose story reflects the blatant anti-Semitism that is a part of official Soviet policy—a policy of harassment, arrest, and imprisonment of Soviet Jews. Professor Alber's thus-far futile efforts to leave the Soviet Union are repeated by thousands of other Soviet Jews refused visas for no other reason than a desire to emigrate to Israel.

We in the United States are watching with alarm the startling decline in Soviet emigration. The number of Jews allowed to leave the U.S.S.R. in February of this year was 283, the lowest figure since 1966. Indeed, the number of Soviet Jews permitted exit visas reached the lowest point in a decade in 1981, when 9,500 individual visas were granted, compared to 21,500 in 1980, and 51,000 permits in 1979.

Fueling our distress over the dramatic reduction in Soviet emigration are reports of escalating, systematic

harassment—deliberate attempts to blot out Jewish cultural activity and religious observance. Soviet KGB officials, armed with threats of arrest, persist in conducting sudden raids, confiscating private property, and banning the teaching of Hebrew and other educational pursuits.

Soviet authorities have targeted the large community of Jewish scientists and academicians for intimidation and public degradation. Prof. Solomon Alber suffers from this very persecution. A mathematician and physicist, Professor Alber was head of the mathematics department at the Institute of Chemical Physics when he applied in 1975 for emigration visas for himself and his family—his wife, Elena, and his sons, Mark and Ilya. He was refused a visa to leave for Israel on the pretext of "state interest," and was soon demoted from his post. Elena, a physician, lost her job as a pathologist as well.

Elena has a serious pulmonary condition, yet was arrested last year and held for hours without cause or explanation. Professor Alber's son, Mark, passed the mathematics exam to enter the University of Moscow, but was denied admission and is now attending an institute for railway engineering, one of the few to which Jews are permitted.

Despite these demoralizing conditions, the Albers retain their hope, their faith, and their determination to leave the Soviet Union. Solomon Alber continues to work in the refusenik movement, actively seeking his family's freedom.

May we in Congress, inspired by the courage of Mr. Alber and his family, call on the President, Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin, and Soviet Premier Brezhnev to demand their freedom, the release of their fellow Jews, and the right to free thought, religion, and emigration.●

REMARKS OF HON. SILVIO O. CONTE REGARDING DAVID SAMIRAN

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, in 1911, David Samiran sailed from France to New York with the \$37 required by law for entrance and a dream to work in the field of aviation.

Samiran enlisted in the Army Signal Corps, aviation section, to work with a small group of men who had high hopes and one airplane. During World War I, Mr. Samiran was promoted to master sergeant and sent overseas to maintain French and English airplanes. While in Poland, Mr. Samiran assisted in the typhus relief expedition

and received the Polish Commemorative Cross for his participation.

Returning to the United States in 1920, Mr. Samiran discovered that 40 percent of all fatal airplane crashes were due to water in the gasoline. He perfected a device now known as a gas segregator to separate the water from the gasoline and in 1932 it became standard Air Force equipment. Today, the device is installed in all servicing trucks.

In 1941, Mr. Samiran was commissioned as a captain. Seven years of research and experimentation went into his invention of a single-point refueling system which is another milestone in aviation history. This refueling method reduced the number of men as well as the amount of time required to refuel an airplane. For his distinguished exceptionally meritorious service to the United States from May 1, 1944 to September 1, 1947, as project engineer for the single-point refueling system, Mr. Samiran received the Legion of Merit. This refueling system led to the development of inflight refueling and contributed greatly toward improved safety and reliability of jet engine aircraft.

On November 30, 1948, Mr. Samiran retired from active duty in the Air Force and retired with 31 years of commendable service and an outstanding contribution to aviation progress. His exceptional engineering ability and extreme devotion to duty is a fine reflection upon himself and the Air Force. To date, Mr. Samiran is credited with more than 40 time-, life-, and money-saving inventions. In addition, he still has several patent applications on file.

I am proud to bring the accomplishments of this fine patriotic American to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker.●

AMERICAN SPIRIT AND VALOR

HON. BILL HENDON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. HENDON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues an article that appeared recently in the Asheville Citizen (North Carolina) recounting the heroic deeds of Mr. Bobby Marlowe, Jr., of Oakley, N.C., which is in my 11th Congressional District. The 22-year-old unemployed printer demonstrated his compassion for his fellowman by singlehandedly pulling two men from their crushed and burning vehicle following an accident, while two other motorists stood idly by. Mr. Marlowe has been nominated for the American Red Cross Certificate of Merit, that organization's highest award for lifesaving, and the Gover-

nor's Bravery and Heroism Award from North Carolina Gov. James B. Hunt. I am proud to represent such a man in Congress and believe he represents the best in American spirit and valor.

[From the Asheville Citizen, Mar. 5, 1982]

AREA MAN RESCUES PAIR TRAPPED IN BURNING CARS

A crowd gathered and watched late Wednesday night as fire began to spread in two wrecked vehicles where two seriously injured men were trapped, but 22-year-old Bobby A. Marlowe plunged through the flames and pulled both victims to safety.

Marlowe, an unemployed printer from Oakley, spotted the wreck about 11:15 p.m. while driving home on U.S. 25-A after visiting his fiancée in Hendersonville.

The accident happened about five miles south of Asheville, less than a mile from the Blue Ridge Parkway.

Rescue workers had not arrived when Marlowe drove by and stopped.

"People were just standing there looking at it," Marlowe said.

Despite Marlowe's efforts to get people in the crowd to help him, he was forced to work alone. "I have a feeling I said some very nasty things. Nobody would do anything to help."

Seconds after he had carried the second victim to safety, one of the vehicles exploded in a searing fireball.

"I was running back and 'bang.' It was a very loud noise, like a whooshing sound. Flames went everywhere," Marlowe said.

Both men were recovering from their injuries Thursday night in Memorial Mission Hospital. James Ernest Lindsey Jr., 30, of 180 Old Cisco Road, was listed in fair condition with two broken legs in the intensive care unit. Harley Denton Harris, also 30, of Arden, was listed in stable condition with head and neck injuries with a broken leg.

"I just thank the Lord he sent me there last night," Marlowe said.

Marlowe first pulled Lindsey from the wreck. Lindsey was pinned beneath a car that had collided nearly head-on with his Datsun pickup truck.

A small fire had started in one of the vehicles, Marlowe said. He pulled Lindsey about 40 feet away from the wreckage.

Spectators said Marlowe picked the vehicle up to free the man. "Somebody said I lifted the doggone thing. I don't remember," he said.

Marlowe said he covered Lindsey with his coat and ran back to the other car, where he heard more moaning.

"I felt through the fire to see if I could find anybody. There was no one in the driver's seat, but I found him on the floor in the back seat of the Ford. I don't remember how I got him out or if it was a two-door or a four-door," Marlowe said.

He said he cradled the man in his arms and ran with him to where the first victim had collapsed on the road's shoulder.

When he was 20 feet from the growing fire, one of the vehicles exploded with a roar.

Marlowe began treating the victims for shock and tried to stop their bleeding, utilizing his own first-aid treatment.

Miraculously, Marlowe was not seriously injured by the blaze. "I burned all the hair off my arms and my beard's scorched. And I still can't get all the blood off my hands," he said.

"I had a pretty good amount of rescue training and first aid from the Red Cross

when I was a lifeguard. Both the fellows were bleeding badly and you could see they had some bad fractures."

Police and ambulance personnel arrived and began treating the two wreck victims. Trooper J. E. Baker with the State Highway Patrol got Marlowe's account of the incident.

Baker's report understates the bravery of Marlowe's act. Marlowe "pulled both drivers to safety," the report said.

Jimmy Hall, assistant chief of the Skyland Fire Department, praised the young man's actions. "He did a heroic thing when he jumped in there as other people were standing around," Hall said.

Marlowe was more modest about the role he played. "I just thank God those boys are all right and it didn't blow sooner. When I took my training, I made a promise between me and my God just to let me help someone before I went, too," he said.●

THE FLAG MAN OF OCEANSIDE

HON. ROBERT E. BADHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. BADHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention at this time the work of a great patriot, Alexander H. Kapitanski. Since 1976, Mr. Kapitanski, better known as the Flag Man of Oceanside has decorated numerous ceremonial functions including parades, banquets, and Boy Scouts and church functions. In so doing, he has given unselfishly of his time and money. During 1981 alone, he decorated 282 different functions in Orange, San Diego, Los Angeles, and Riverside Counties in California and displayed a total of 33,282 flags which is a record.

His great love of his country is further shown by the fact that Mr. Kapitanski, the son of Polish immigrants, left high school early to enlist in the Army during World War II. He served in Europe as an aerial and ground reconnaissance combat photographer and was cited for meritorious service as well as receiving the Bronze Star.

I know that Mr. Kapitanski's flag displays have been a real inspiration to those who have seen them. The Flag Man of Oceanside is truly a great American, and I want you to know how proud I am to have him as my constituent.●

REAUTHORIZING THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

HON. THOMAS B. EVANS, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. EVANS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, in the coming months the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the full House will be considering legislation to reauthorize the Endan-

gered Species Act. While I am sure that most Members of this body support the principle of protecting endangered species, specific aspects of the act have sometimes been the subject of considerable discussion. It is important that as my colleagues consider the Endangered Species Act, we do so in the context of what is happening to our natural heritage on a worldwide scale.

No one knows exactly how many plant and animal species inhabit the Earth, but it is on the order of 5 to 10 million. In testimony presented before the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment, Dr. Peter H. Raven, director of the Missouri Botanical Garden, stated:

*** Something like a million species, amounting to about a quarter of the diversity of life on earth, will become extinct during the next 30 years or so—in other words, within the lifetime of a majority of those alive at the present day.

Even if one's only concern is the practical contribution of plants and animals to the welfare of the human race, the consequences of such a loss of biological diversity are serious indeed.

The contribution of wild species to the welfare of mankind in agriculture, medicine, industry, and science have been of incalculable value. These contributions will continue, if we protect our storehouse of biological diversity. Just as one example, in his statement before the subcommittee, Dr. Raven described how research on several species of evening primrose has turned up a fatty substance that may help us to avoid coronary heart disease and to cure such diseases as eczema and arthritis that afflict millions and millions of people. Members of this same plant family are protected under our Endangered Species Act. Who knows what secrets of medical science they hold?

The tragedy of losing plant and animal species to the void of extinction is that we are losing them at a pace far faster than we can evaluate their utility to man. The Honorable James L. Buckley, Under Secretary of State, recently stated:

The maintenance of biological diversity is fundamental not only to maintaining life on earth over the long term, but also to achieving our economic development and quality of life goals over the nearer term. *** Permitting high rates of extinction *** is tantamount to bookburning; but it is even worse, in that it involves books yet to be deciphered and read.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that our wild plants and animals are not only uplifting to the human spirit, but they are absolutely essential—as a practical matter—to our continued healthy existence. I support reauthorization of a strong Endangered Species Act, one that vigorously protects our natural

heritage at the same time as it provides for a timely balancing of environmental and economic interests on those rare occasions when the two are irreconcilably in conflict. Both elements are necessary if we are to have a strong, workable act.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues consider the Endangered Species Act, I hope that they will bear in mind the inestimable value of our wild natural heritage. This perspective was presented very nicely in a statement by Dr. Thomas Eisner, Jacob Gould Schurman Professor of Biology at Cornell University, before the Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife Conservation and the Environment on February 22, 1982. For the benefit of my colleagues I ask that the following excerpts from Dr. Eisner's testimony be made a part of the RECORD.

STATEMENT OF DR. THOMAS EISNER

My name is Thomas Eisner. I am the Jacob Gould Schurman Professor of Biology at Cornell University. I am a member of the National Academy of Sciences, and the elected chairman of the Section of Biology of the American Association for the Advancement of Sciences, the largest scientific organization in the United States.

I am a research biologist in the field of chemical ecology. My interest is the chemistry of nature. For over twenty years my collaborators and I have been isolating, identifying, and studying the biological properties of new chemical substances derived from animals and plants.

What is an endangered species to the research biologist? Why do those of us who work on the chemistry of animals and plants, and who can envision the benefits to be derived from such research, feel that there is such a compelling need to protect endangered species?

Let me deal with some foreseeable consequences first. At the most basic level, species extinction means a diminution of biological diversity. A diminution of diversity, in turn, means a loss of some of the chemical treasure of nature. Let us not lose sight of our enormous dependence on this treasure. A large proportion of the chemicals in use in our present-day civilization were "invented" by nature, not by the chemist in the laboratory. Take just one example: medical chemistry. It has been estimated that fully 40 percent of all prescriptions written in the United States contain as their chief ingredients compounds derived from plants, including lower plants. It was through exploration of nature that these drugs were discovered. And such exploration has a long history of paying off. The Incas already knew of the antimalarial properties of the bark of the cinchona tree, from which quinine was later isolated, and the foxglove plant, the well-known source of the heart drug digitalis, was already in medicinal use in medieval time. But many of the most important plant drugs in current use were only recently discovered, including, for example, some of the antileukemic compounds and anticancer drugs such as vincristine, derived from the periwinkle plant and used in the treatment of Hodgkin's disease. There is no end to the potential for discovery of this sort in nature, because we have only begun the chemical exploration of nature. Two of the compounds that I mentioned, quinine

and vincristine, belong to that major class of chemicals called alkaloids. Thousands of alkaloids are now known, including many that have practical uses. Yet only about 2 percent of the flowering plants—5,000 of some one-quarter million species—have been tested for presence of alkaloids. The majority of these compounds are still unknown, locked away in the unexplored world of plants. We are essentially no better informed about the natural distribution of the other major types of organic compounds.

Organic chemistry, the science that deals with the isolation and characterization of natural products, has made extraordinary progress in recent times. Great simplification has occurred in the procedures by which natural products are isolated from the complex mixtures in which they occur in nature, and minute amounts of a substance often suffice for its complete elucidation. To home in on the chemical unknowns of nature is now a less laborious task than it used to be, and the prospects for discovery are at an all time high. Yet even with accelerated exploration (an impossibility at current funding levels for basic research) the increased rate of discovery could not possibly keep pace with the rising tide of species extinction. Unless the erosion of nature is halted, much of what is now unknown will vanish before it is known. I find this prospect utterly distressing!

Please note that I have emphasized the importance of plants as depositories of useful chemicals. Plants are the source of most natural products in human use, and doubtless the source of vast numbers of additional useful chemicals yet unknown. Their diversity must be preserved, as must that of the invertebrates, those "lower" animals toward which we usually show no sympathy. They are, quite literally, a vast treasure of inestimable value. In our own laboratory, for example, in the last few years, working as a relatively modest group of 5 to 7 researchers, we have isolated (1) potential heart drugs from fireflies, (2) a cockroach repellent from a millipede, (3) a nerve drug from another millipede, and (4) shark repellents from a marine mollusc. There is really no telling what, in the line of novel biological materials, the lower animals might have to offer. Despite this, I am aware that some have proposed that plants and invertebrates be excluded from protection under the Endangered Species Act. Such proposals can be supported by neither scientific nor human welfare considerations. They reflect instead a misunderstanding of the reasons for preserving biological diversity so fundamental as to warrant the label "biological illiteracy."

Let me provide a concrete example. There is a group of invertebrates called Bryozoa or moss animals, that is little known even to most biologists. I happen to have a jar of Bryozoa with me, should any of you wish to have a look at them. All Bryozoa are aquatic; most are marine. A chemical has now been isolated from certain of these animals about which, I venture to predict, a good deal will be heard in the months to come. The compound, assigned the designation K-112 by the National Cancer Institute, happens to be an anticancer agent of extraordinary potency, effective in standard antileukemic tests at the strikingly low concentration of 35 parts per billion! The compound is being studied by a group of chemists, including my Cornell colleague Jon Clardy, who tells me that it is an entirely new type of antitumor agent. Following its identification, synthetic programs will doubtless be insti-

tuted aimed at producing a whole spectrum of molecular variants of this particular compound. Unexpected discoveries from unexpected sources—that is the rule of the day when one searches for natural products. Who would have guessed the presence of cancer drugs in moss animals?

My final point about the consequences of species extinction concerns what may well, in the long run, prove to be the most serious consequence. It is a consequence that biologists are only now beginning to appreciate, and may need some years to appreciate in full. Let me elaborate in brief. As a result of recent breakthroughs in genetic engineering—breakthroughs which have occurred since the Endangered Species Act was passed—a species must now be viewed as more than just a unique conglomerate of genes. It must be viewed also as a depository of genes that are potentially transferrable. The technology of gene transfer, nonexistent only a few years ago, is now beyond the stage of infancy. Genes can be transferred between microorganisms, they are beginning to be transferred between animals, and they will doubtless eventually be transferrable between plants. The implications of this technology are tremendous and the subject of intense current discussion. The extinction of a species, in light of these advances, takes on new meaning. It does not simply mean the loss of a single page from the library of nature, but the loss of an entire volume whose individual pages, were the species to survive, would remain available in perpetuity for selective transfer and modification of other species. The notion that species extinction means the loss of individual utilizeable genes must now be squarely faced. ●

THE NEED FOR CONGRESS TO PASS THE DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE REVITALIZATION ACT, H.R. 5540

HON. JAMES J. BLANCHARD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. BLANCHARD. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Christian Science Monitor underscores the pressing need for Congress to take action in modernizing our defense industrial base. That action can come through passage of H.R. 5540, the Defense Industrial Base Revitalization Act, a series of new major amendments to the Defense Production Act of 1950.

The House Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization has conducted numerous hearings on this overall problem. For example, Gen. Alton D. Slay, former commander of the Air Force Systems Command, told us only 1 week ago that the United States is "well on our way toward becoming a second-rate industrial power because we are forfeiting our competitive position in the world. . . ." He went on to point out that this was due to a lack of investment in R. & D. and in modern, productive plant and equipment, and through the lack of effective training

and retraining systems for key future skills.

H.R. 5540 directly addresses these problems, and I am happy to report the bill was reported out of our subcommittee on March 24 by a vote of 19 to 3 with strong bipartisan support.

The text of the Christian Science Monitor article, which was published March 1, follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 1, 1982]

REVIVING UP DEFENSE INDUSTRY WON'T BE EASY

(By Brad Knickerbocker)

While Congress argues over whether to cut the 1983 Reagan defense budget by a relatively paltry \$10 billion or \$15 billion, another troubling question persists:

Will American industry be able to handle the trillion-dollar-plus Pentagon buildup that will occur through the mid-1980's?

There is general agreement that the defense industrial base today is far from what it should be. Long lead times, increasing dependence on foreign suppliers, shortages of skilled manpower, and aging plants and equipment are just some of the problems. Without major changes by government and industry, defense analysts agree, increased spending could simply accelerate inflation and add to the cost overruns that make the nation less secure.

In its first year, the Reagan administration has taken some steps toward solving a problem that continues to get worse. "But we are not there yet," says Fred Ikle, undersecretary of defense for policy. "And I am personally troubled that it takes so long to move ahead on this large and complex issue."

Symptoms of the problem include:

The National Science Foundation prediction of a 47 percent shortage in industrial engineers in the 1980s.

A possible shortage of 250,000 machinists by the mid-1980s, even without rapid growth in the U.S. arsenal, according to the Defense Science Board. Yet the average machinist in this country is 58 years old and may soon be retiring.

Of the 26,000 metal cutting and forming tools owned by the government, 20,000 are more than 20 years old and therefore inefficient, the Defense Science Board also reports.

Of the 61 individual materials or family groups in the strategic stockpile, shortfalls exist in 37 (23 of which are at less than half the approved level).

Thousands of U.S. defense contractors have folded or stopped taking Pentagon orders. As a result, bottlenecks occur and lead times lengthen. For example, the lead time for an F-16 jet fighter grew from 28 weeks in 1977 to 42 weeks three years later. Lead times for military jet engines and aircraft landing gear more than doubled over the same period.

"The unpredictability of defense spending has discouraged firms from modernizing," says Sikorsky Aircraft Company vice-president Harvey White. "Scores of contractors have quit the defense business for more lucrative work."

Says Jacques Gansler, a former Defense Department official who gathered much of this information in his book "The Defense Industry," "We're spending more and more dollars a year and getting less and less equipment."

"Without changes, we'll get increases in the cost of defense goods without strength-

ening our posture," Dr. Gansler told a recent gathering of government officials, military officers, business executives, and defense analysts at the Brookings Institution.

This is especially true, others note, since military planning under the Reagan administration is shifting from the "short-warning, short-war" scenario to conflicts of longer duration on many fronts. If there is a longer conflict, the General Accounting Office warns, "Huge gaps exist between when military stocks will be exhausted and when production will equal needs."

All aspects of Pentagon spending are scheduled to rise steadily over the next five years. But the increase in spending for new weapons (procurement and research and development) is even sharper, more so than during the Vietnam war. Economist Charles Schultze estimates this to be 16 percent per year between 1981 and 1985 for a five-year total of 80 percent.

"This implies the rather startling conclusion that some 30 percent of the increase in the 'goods producing' GNP (Gross National Product) over the next four years will go to the military," Dr. Schultze told the congressional Joint Economic Committee.

In other words, the defense industrial base could be severely strained by the increased defense buildup, the emphasis on mobility and readiness, and the goal of increasing "surge capacity" to meet military emergencies.

Among the steps taken by the Reagan administration to relieve this potential strain are these:

President Reagan has approved the first defense stockpile purchase program in 20 years. This is for \$100 million in strategic materials, \$70 million of which is for cobalt.

The administration has begun multi-year procurement of many weapons, including A-6 airplanes, Blackhawk helicopters, fleet oilers, and NATO Seasparrow missiles. Officials say this gives contractors greater stability and can result in savings of 10-20 percent over the long run. Multi-year initiatives for 1983 will add \$578 million to that year's defense budget, but eventually save \$815 million over five years, the Pentagon contends.

Similarly, the Pentagon plans to "surge" production of the controversial M-1 tank from 60 a month to 90 a month for six months in 1982 at an increased cost of \$126 million. "That cost could be more than recovered after multi-year programming," said Defense Undersecretary Ikle.

Defense suppliers welcome multi-year contracting, but some are not so sure about the size of the potential savings. "We don't see anywhere near a 10-15 percent saving in multi-year contracts," said George Graff, president of the McDonnell Aircraft Company, which subcontracts on a multi-year basis.

The Defense Department has begun to "budget to most likely cost" as another means of increasing procurement stability for government and business. This means using a more accurate predicted inflation figure, including reserves for "technological uncertainties," and spending more money "up front" for productivity improvements. The Pentagon will get some unwanted help here from a 1982 defense appropriations bill amendment requiring Congress to be notified whenever estimated costs exceed a certain percentage.

Working against this, others note, may be the Reagan emphasis on decentralizing authority to the individual services. They will

be put in the uncomfortable position of having to cut some programs if they are to "budget honestly." Part of the problem, it is generally recognized, is that the services as well as defense contractors have traditionally "bought in" to the defense budget by underestimating full costs for favored weapons.

The Reagan administration has increased its predecessor's 1983-87 military preparedness budget by 44 percent, from \$5.2 billion to \$7.5 billion. For example, the Army's manufacturing technology program is to be doubled.

The administration has launched what it calls "a new spirit of cooperation" with the defense industry, consulting more closely and seeking the advice of industry executives. To those concerned with President Eisenhower's warning of a "military-industrial complex" (or retiring Admiral Hyman Rickover's more recent charge that "political and economic power is increasingly being concentrated among a few large corporations"), Deputy Defense Secretary Frank Carlucci says the Pentagon still intends to "be tough in contract negotiations as part of the buyer-seller relationship."

While generally lauded for its actions to improve the defense industrial base thus far, the administration is being criticized on some important points. Antonia Handler Chayes, Air Force undersecretary in the Carter administration, says "cutting back on student loans will prevent a lot of potential engineers from even going to college." Others say the same about cuts in federal job-training programs.

Under pressure from Congress, Deputy Defense Secretary Carlucci added "increased competition" to the 31 "management principles" outlined last year to improve the acquisition process. Still, says Jacques Gansler "No large weapons have gone to dual sourcing [in effect, competition from design through production] which is the form of competition that can really save money."

"I think we are moving in the right direction," says Dr. Gansler. "However, we have an awfully long way to go." ●

SALUTE TO THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR ILEITIS AND COLITIS THIRD ANNUAL ROLF BENIRSCHKE CELEBRITY ROAST AND REVUE

HON. BILL LOWERY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, the San Diego Chapter of the National Foundation for Ileitis and Colitis received its charter in 1980. In just 2½ years, the membership has grown from an initial group of 30 concerned people and 1 dedicated physician to over 200 members and more than a dozen interested physicians. An astonishing spirit of personal concern for the welfare of one another and an intense sense of warmth, compassion, and understanding have developed among its members. The organization has become a refuge where the sick, discouraged, frightened, and dismayed

can come to see that others who have ileitis or colitis are coping, living active lives, or enjoying a remission.

The educational programs of the San Diego chapter, which are presented by distinguished physicians and scientists from a variety of disciplines, have been enthusiastically received by more than 100 people who attend lectures and informative discussions every month. Providing information in terms that lay people can understand has been enormously successful in allaying fear, eliminating misconceptions, and stimulating hope.

The National Foundation for Ileitis and Colitis is the largest nonprofit agency in the field of digestive diseases. Although the foundation is only 16 years old, it has made a major impact on attitudes toward these diseases among the public, the Government, and the medical community.

Since NFIC was first organized in 1966 by a small group of dedicated lay people and physicians, it has grown to over 30 chapters throughout the country, sponsoring some 40 different investigative studies at major medical institutions. NFIC's research program has even expanded abroad where the foundation is funding research projects at the University of Leiden in the Netherlands and at Hebrew University-Hadassah Medical Center in Israel.

The foundation has earned universal respect for the integrity of its scientific research projects and its attempts to not only increase the number of qualified scientists working in research in the field of inflammatory bowel diseases, but to narrow the range of focus to those areas which are deemed most promising for substantive results, building continually on the data results of each completed study.

I salute the San Diego Chapter of NFIC in their fundraising effort, the Third Annual Rolf Benirschke Celebrity Roast and Revue to be held on May 1, 1982.●

ACTION ON NUCLEAR WASTE MANAGEMENT LEGISLATION A MUST

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, although we in Congress often fancy ourselves as brilliant practitioners of the legislative process, occasionally the folk back home can insightfully pierce our armor of perceived omniscience and infallibility in policymaking. Excerpts from a recent editorial in the Lincoln (Nebraska) Journal entitled "Dealing With Nuclear Waste Is Part Of Nuclear Bargain" carry a clear message regarding the nuclear waste

management problem which Congress continually seems incapable of addressing.

Now that the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has approved H.R. 3809, I hope that the other two committees of this body, the House and the Congress will move swiftly in order to pass this vital legislation yet this year. As the editorial below indicates, the time is long past for further delay. I hope all of my colleagues will read the following remarks and remember them as we prepare for debate on this issue:

The overall problem of nuclear waste disposal is one which the United States just has not addressed; not in the military field nor in the civilian applications. We have temporized. We temporize still.

But this is a practical problem which cannot be put off indefinitely.

A nation which styles and thinks itself fundamentally protected by nuclear armaments and a people who routinely enjoy electrical energy generated by nuclear power plants ultimately must pay the costs, the full costs.

We have yet to treat seriously the material and social byproducts of those military and civilian nuclear decisions.

The cowardly—and immoral—national strategy appears to be to let future generations worry about all this, and pay for it as well.

Precisely that same attitude years ago robbed the nation of great gobs of its most fertile farmland. Many Midwestern coal strip mines were thoughtlessly operated, topsoil then being insufficiently regarded.

Those of us who have shared in the benefits should be expected to pay for those benefits.

Nuclear power may prove a Faustian bargain for all of mankind, but we've already bought into it.

The clock isn't going to be rolled back—at least not on already operating plants.●

OUR NUCLEAR DEFENSE POSTURE

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, to hear President Reagan stand at his press conference on March 31 and criticize our nuclear defense posture was very disturbing. To say that the United States is vulnerable and that the Soviets could survive our retaliatory attack as the President did completely misstate the facts. The fact is the Soviets do not hold any clear advantage over the United States in nuclear forces.

The weapons deployment cycles of the two superpowers do not run in tandem. Various aspects of the two sides' weapons systems have developed at different rates. Also, both sides have concentrated on different weapons systems in building up their arsenals. The U.S. strategic nuclear forces, for example, have been distributed

among three different delivery systems—land-, submarine-, and air-based—with the nuclear assets allocated most abundantly to the most survivable system—nuclear powered submarines. On the other hand, the bulk of the Soviet nuclear forces are land-based. While the Soviets lead the United States in launchers and throw-weight, the United States leads the Soviets in the number of warheads, 9,200 to 6,000. While the Soviet strategic submarine force is large and improving all the time, it is not equal to the U.S. strategic submarine force.

While the Soviets lead us in counterforce weapons, we lead them in the total number of MIRVed launchers, 1,100 to 900. The Soviets also have no bomber force to speak of while the United States has 26 percent of its missiles on intercontinental bombers.

The current forces of both sides are in a better balance now than at any other time. In terms of retaliatory capacity, the United States is in much better shape than the Soviet Union because it has wisely diversified its weapons systems while about 80 percent of the Soviet missiles are in vulnerable land-based silos.

The window of vulnerability. The concern at this moment is the Soviet advantage in counterforce weapons. The Soviets are presently ahead of the United States in hard-target killing warheads, which can reach their targets quickly. The window of vulnerability theory supposes that in an extreme crisis, like the Cuban missile crisis, the Soviets might launch 200 of their SS-18's, each with 10 warheads, with high confidence that these 2,000 warheads would destroy almost all of the 1,000 U.S. fixed ICBM's. Other Soviet SLBM's and ICBM's presumably could destroy U.S. strategic bombers on the airfields and submarines in port. An American President would then be left in a quandry. The President could accept the initial casualties. Or he could fire the remaining missiles, thus inviting further devastation from a Soviet counterattack.

This scenario, however, is terribly flawed. It assumes that the Soviets could carry out a near-perfect attack, which few experts believe is possible. It assumes that an American President would allow 20 million or more Americans to die and not launch the remaining missiles. Even with a brilliantly executed Soviet first strike, the United States would retain the capability to kill more than 30 percent of the Soviet population and destroy more than 75 percent of Soviet industry, and at the same time hold warheads in reserve.

Whatever imbalances exist, the Conte-Markey/Kennedy-Hatfield resolution, it must be remembered, calls not only for a freeze, but also for a reduction in nuclear arsenals. It calls for a reduction in weapons such as the

Soviet SS-18 that increase instability. The Reagan administration is proposing a multibillion-dollar massive nuclear arms buildup that in the end will not eliminate the counterforce problem.

A negotiated freeze and reductions agreement, on the other hand, would address the counterforce problem by reducing the high-quality ICBM's the Soviets now have and by preventing both sides from deploying any more hard-target killing weapons.●

REAGAN BUDGET PROPOSALS ON ANIMAL HEALTH PROGRAMS

HON. TOM HARKIN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Reagan administration budget makes reckless cutbacks in U.S. animal health programs. If enacted, these cuts will threaten every livestock producer in Iowa as well as the public health and safety.

Of primary concern is first, the proposed reductions and virtual phaseout of the brucellosis eradication program, and second, failure to recommend any funding for pilot projects to control and eradicate pseudorabies in swine.

BRUCELLOSIS

For brucellosis, the proposed cut-back is as follows:

Fiscal years:	Millions
1982.....	\$91
1983.....	60
1984.....	26
1985 and after	6

The essence of these cuts is to move away from a highly successful program toward a "voluntary vaccination control at the expense of the producer program." The proposed budget cuts will eliminate indemnity payments based upon fair market value and will eliminate, for all practical purposes, funds for Federal vaccination, primarily in the high incidence States of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida, and Arkansas where every effort is now being made to vaccinate all animals on an accelerated basis. The \$6 million budget residue slated for "brucellosis control" files in the face of every sound principle which has been established by the National Brucellosis Technical Commission, August 1978, for eradicating this highly transmissible and pathogenic disease.

Since 1950, \$700 million has been spent to "control" brucellosis, and admittedly the program has had a checkered history. However, the No. 1 finding of the Technical Commission is that we can eradicate the disease and this led to the recently revamped uniform methods and rules which just became effective April 1 of last year.

All States have now implemented this program in addition to adopting many of the criticisms in the management of the program made by the General Accounting Office (GAO).

Since 1950, we have reduced the number of reported cases of human brucellosis—undulant fever—from 6,200 to 180 per year. The infection rate in cattle has been reduced from 5.6 percent in 1950 to 0.4 percent in 1981.

If these cuts are made, all progress made in controlling and eradicating the disease will be wiped out in a few years.

In fact, Dr. Harry Mussman, Administrator of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), recently testified before our committee that with no Federal effort, losses from brucellosis would soon exceed \$1 billion annually, compared with the loss of \$34 million last year.

States like Iowa, which are either free or nearly free of the disease, will be forced to retaliate against infected States. Barriers to the interstate movement of cattle, swine, and milk will result. Foreign nations will be reluctant to buy our cattle, particularly those which are now brucellosis free.

I say, let us give the revised program a chance to work, and I say it is working. For example, in the last year the number of infected herds in Iowa has dropped from 53 to 34 and similar reductions have been made in most other States.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Livestock, Dairy, and Poultry, I intend to hold hearings later this spring to fully explore the impact of these cuts and to hopefully galvanize support throughout the livestock industry for continuing this program.

PSEUDORABIES

Last summer my subcommittee held a full day of hearings in Washington on the subject of pseudorabies control and eradication in swine.

The purpose of the hearing was to review USDA efforts to control the disease and to hear from the various segments of the swine industry with respect to USDA activities.

One clear and unanimous message that came from all segments of the industry was that pilot projects to control and eradicate the disease were needed immediately.

In fact, Dr. Mussman stated at that hearing that the USDA was in the process of requesting a \$1.5 million supplemental appropriation request for fiscal year 1982. However, to date no request has been made by the administration to the Congress and no mention was made in the President's budget for fiscal year 1983.

To quote Dr. Mussman from our recent budget hearing before the committee:

So, we're faced right now with several states already on board as far as the pilot

project interest is concerned. They have indicated their commitment of money. The projects have been designed and we're simply not in the position to move forward with them at this time, neither now nor, according to the budget, for 1983. I find this very regrettable because the longer the whole situation is delayed, the greater the losses will be and the more difficulty we will experience in getting a handle on it.

Over 9 percent of all swine now have pseudorabies. A few years ago this was less than 2 percent.

The need for a Federal commitment to this disease is obvious. But this administration is ignoring the needs of the pork industry.

During recent consideration of the budget by the Committee on Agriculture, I successfully offered an amendment which recommends \$1.5 million for pseudorabies pilot projects to the House Budget Committee. I am hopeful this recommendation will survive the budget process.●

A CENTURY OF SERVICE FROM MATSON NAVIGATION CO.

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, this next Wednesday, the 10th of April, the Matson Navigation Co., will be celebrating its 100th anniversary of shipping service to the west coast of our country. The Matson Navigation Co., was launched in 1882 when Capt. William Matson, then a relatively young skipper 33 years of age, sailed the *Emma Claudina*, a three-masted schooner, from San Francisco to Hilo, Hawaii, with about 300 tons of foodstuffs, plantation supplies, and miscellaneous general merchandise aboard. On the return voyage to San Francisco, he carried sugar, coconuts, hides, and railroad ties.

The name "Matson" has been synonymous with the sea trade between the west coast and Hawaii ever since, and for many years was expanded to include Australia. But what changes we have seen in the vessels flying the Matson house flag in these past hundred years. In 1897 William Matson exchanged the *Emma Claudina* for the brigantine *Lurline*, which more than doubled his carrying capacity. And, in 1891, he entered the passenger trade with the wooden barkentine *Harvester*, which had a capacity of 10 passengers.

While a recitation of the divergent activities in which Matson has participated at various times, including ownership of an oil company, an airline, hotels, and mergers with other steamship operators is indeed impressive, what is most significant is that through this hundred years Matson

people have never been content to rest on their laurels. They have a long string of firsts which are indicative of the progressive and forward-thinking nature of Matson.

Matson operated the first ship in the Pacific with electric lights. Matson operated the first ship with a cold storage facility. Matson operated the first offshore ship to burn oil instead of coal. In 1927, the SS *Malolo* was the fastest ship in the Pacific, with the speed of 22 knots. Matson, in 1956, was the first steamship line to establish an integrated research department at top management level. Two years later, Matson initiated containerized cargo shipments. In 1960 Matson began operating the first all-container carrier in the Pacific. Matson initiated the first "roll-on, roll-off" service to Hawaii. And Matson's last "first" is the development and operation of a new, computer controlled overhead crane container handling system on Terminal Island.

As you can see, Matson has been continuously on the move and making significant contributions to increase and productivity in the maritime trades. And, I am sure Mr. Speaker, that the next hundred years for Matson, will see equally important changes developed. My wife Lee joins me in congratulating Mr. Michael S. Wasacz, the current president and chief operating officer of Matson Navigation Co., Mr. John C. Couch, Matson senior vice president and southern California area manager, and all those associated with this fine company on the completion of a highly successful first 100 years, and extending our very best wishes to Matson as they commence their second hundred years. ●

ARMED FORCES COMMUNICATIONS AND ELECTRONICS ASSOCIATION

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to your attention a fast-growing association in northern Virginia, the Armed Forces Communications and Electronics Association (AFCEA). I attended a ground-breaking ceremony on March 31, 1982, of the AFCEA at Burke Centre, Va. This organization is of the highest professional caliber and I am pleased that they have chosen to erect their own building in the State of Virginia. Not only do associations provide jobs for local residents, increased tax revenues, incentives for new businesses to support services, but what they do not do is also important: No polluting, no dumping, no smoking smoke stacks. They are an ideal indus-

try keeping the environment clean and employing a very high caliber of professionals.

Despite recessionary trends around the world, the high productivity and ingenuity of AFCEA's 400 corporate members, and its 20,000 professionals, and the increasing Free World demands for and on the command, control, communications, and intelligence (C³I) technology they create have produced a dramatic growth of resources and members for the association.

Many high technology forecasters look on the new AFCEA building as a sign of the times. Most recognize the advances that lie ahead will dwarf those of the past decade. In that march forward C³I concerns will dominate international geopolitical discussions. AFCEA's role in bringing together free world governments, industry, and armed forces will assume increased importance and visibility.

AFCEA is the renowned leader in the rapidly expanding field of high technology and provides a bridge between military, industry, and Government.

This leadership is important in AFCEA's field but also in Fairfax County and Virginia which are becoming magnets for high technology companies. The county and the State have the attractive resources like efficient transportation systems, reasonable labor costs, excellent educational systems, State-regulated employment costs, reasonable State and local financial policies, and a good overall business climate which are inviting to these companies. AFCEA's move will help focus even more attention on the unique qualities of our area.

I believe that high technology is the key to the State's economic development and that is another reason we should pay a special tribute to AFCEA. AFCEA's leadership is important not only to improve national and international security but also to the economy of our country.

In Congress, we have worked to allow certain tax advantages to spur this type of economic growth because private enterprise is the key to restoring prosperity in the country. It is encouraging to see organizations like AFCEA respond with such a vigor. This association and its private member corporations are an excellent example of the successful partnership that can develop when Congress, private corporations, and our State Government work together for the good of the State and the good of the Nation. It makes the world more productive and a better place to be.

Senator JOHN WARNER sent his congratulations and stated in his message:

AFCEA, recognized leader in the area of electronics and engineering, encourages government, military, and industrial ideas on the vital issues of today. From this interaction, our Nation and the World derive the

advantage of a melting pot of the best minds in these fields. Individuals and corporations involved in high-technology look to AFCEA for leadership; they will now look also to our fine State of Virginia as they seek to locate within an environment appropriate to the specialized nature of their business. For Virginia offers a favorable business climate, enhanced by excellent transportation and educational systems, a cream-of-the-Hi-Tech-crop labor force, unsurpassed life style *** and all this within reach of the heart of the U.S. Government *** the world's largest consumer of Hi-Tech goods and services.

Other dignitaries in attendance included Dr. Jon L. Boyes (VAdm. USN Ret.), international president of AFCEA, Judith H. Shreve, editor and publisher of SIGNAL Magazine, and Earle Williams, president of The BDM Corp.

AFCEA CORPORATE MEMBERS

SUSTAINING MEMBERS

ADC/Magnetic Controls Co., American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Long Lines Dept., Automation Industries, Inc., Vitro Laboratories Div.

BDM Corp., The BR Communications Barry Research Corp., Boeing Co., The Bolt Beranek and Newman Inc., Booz, Allen & Hamilton, Inc.

COMSAT General Corp., CSC Systems Group, Computer Sciences Corp., Cincinnati Electronics Corp., Continental Telephone Corp.

Digital Equipment Corp. E-Systems, Inc., Electronic Data Systems Electrospace Systems, Inc.

Ford Aerospace & Communications Corp. General Cable Co., General Electric Co., General Telephone & Electronics Corp., Gould, Inc., Government Systems Group, Grumman Data Systems Corp.

Harris Corp., Honeywell Inc., Avionics Div., Honeywell Information Systems, Hughes Aircraft Co.

ITT Telecommunications and Electronics Group—North America, International Business Machines Corp., Interstate Electronics Corp.

Kentron International, Inc. Litton Industries, Inc., Lockheed Missiles & Space Co.

Magnavox Government and Industrial Electronics Co., Martin Marietta Corp., McDonnell Douglas Corp., MODCOMP (Modular Computer Systems, Inc.).

Norden Systems, Inc., United Technologies Corp., North American Philips Corp., Northrop Corp.

Perkin-Elmer Data Systems, Planning Research Corp.

RCA Corp., Racal Communications Inc., Raytheon Co., Rockwell International.

Sanders Assoc., Inc., Singer Co., The Sylva Systems Group, GTE Products Div., System Development Corp.

TRW Systems, TRW Inc., Tracor, Inc., Aerospace Group

United States Postal Service, United Telecommunications, Inc.

Western Electric Co., Inc., Western Union Telegraph Co.

GROUP MEMBERS

ABA Electromechanical Systems, Inc., AM International, Inc., ATACS Corp., AT&T International, Administrative Sciences Corp., Advanced Research and Applications Corp., Aerospace Corp., The Air-Ground Electronics Co., Inc., Alascom, Inc., Alden

Electronic & Impulse Recording Equipment Co., Inc., Alvarado Industries, Inc., Amecom Div., Litton Systems, Inc., American Electronic Laboratories, Inc., American Radio Relay League, The American Satellite Company, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Ampex Corp., Analytic Sciences Corp., The Analytical Systems Engineering Corp., Analytics Inc., Antekna, Inc., Div. of Itek Corp., Apex Airtronics, Inc., Applied Communications, A Division of Amstar Technical Products, Applied Data Research, Inc., Argosystems, Inc., Arinc Research Corp., Arvin/Echo Science Corp., Associated Industries, Astronautics Corp. of America, Atlantic Research Corp., Avionics & Missiles Group, Rockwell International, Aydin Corp.

BKC Inc., Ball Aerospace Systems Div., Baroni & Associates, Inc., Bell Canada International, Bell Communications Systems Inc., Bell-Northern Research Ltd., Bell Technical Operations Corp., Bell Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania, The Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc., Bendix Corp., Communications Div., Betac Corp., Brault & Associates, Ltd., Breeze-Illinois, Inc., Burroughs Corp.

CPT Corp., CTEC Inc., Calculon Corp., California Microwave, Inc., Defense Electronics Div., Calspan Corp., Canadian Marconi Co., Carolina Telephone & Telegraph Co., Central Telephone Co. of Texas, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. (D.C.), The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Maryland, The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. of Virginia, The Cirtech Corp., Coastcom, Codex Corp., Colorado Video, Inc., Com Dev, Inc., Command, Control & Communications Corp., Commart, Inc., Commercial Telecommunications Group, Rockwell International, Communication Associates, Inc., Communications Co. (COMCO), Communications Industries, Inc., Communications Mfg. Co., Communications Satellite Corp., Compression Labs, Inc., Computer Data Systems, Inc., Computing Devices Co., Comstron Corp., Comtech Telecommunications Corp., Conrac Corp., Systems Group, Continental Electronics Mfg. Co., Control Data Corp., Cortronics Systems International, Craig Systems Corp., Cray Research, Inc., Cubic Communications, Inc., Cushman Electronics, Inc.

DMS Inc., Data Communications Systems Corp., Datametrics Corp., Dataproducts New England, Inc., Data Solutions Corp., Data Systems Analysts, Inc., Datotek, Inc., Datron Systems, Inc., Decisions and Designs, Inc., Delta Electronics, Inc., Dictaphone Corp., Special Markets Div., Digital Communications Corp., Digitech Data Industries, Inc., Dorne & Margolin, Inc., Dynair Electronics, Inc., Dynallectron Corp./Systems Services Div., Dynamic Sciences.

EASAMS Limited, EFRATOM, EMM, ENSCO, Inc. (Defense Group), EXTEL Corp., Eaton Corp., AIL Division, Electrac Space Electronics Laboratory, Inc., Electronic Industry Association of Korea, Electronic Systems Group, Rockwell International, Electronics, Missiles and Communications, Inc., Emerson Electric Co., Ericsson Corp., Exhibit Aids, Inc.

Fairchild Weston Systems, Inc., Fairchild Space & Electronics Co., Fluke B. V., Frederick Electronics Corp., Frost and Sullivan, Inc.

GENASYS Corp., Gandalf Data Communications Ltd., Garrett Manufacturing Ltd., General DataComm Industries, Inc., General Dynamics Corp., Genisco Technology Corp., Memory Products Div., Global Ther-

moelectric Power Systems Ltd., Grumman Aerospace Corp.

HDR Systems, Inc., HRB-Singer, Inc., Halcyon Communications, Inc., Halifax Engineering, Inc., Harris Data Communications Inc., Harris Digital Telephone Systems Div., Harris Government Systems Group, Harris-PRD Electronics Div., Harris-RF Communications Inc., Hawaiian Telephone Co., Hazeltine Corp., Hekimian Laboratories, Inc., Henkels & McCoy, Inc.—Engineering Div., Hermes Electronics Ltd., Hewlett-Packard Co., Electronic Measuring Instruments Div., Honeywell Inc., Defense Electronics Div.

IFR, Inc., IIT Research Institute, INCO, Inc., INTEC Inc., IOCS, Inc., ITT Europe Inc., ITT World Communications Inc., Ideal Aeromath, Inc., Indiana Bell Telephone Co., Inc., Informatics Inc., Infotec Development, Inc. (IDI), Infotron Systems Corp., Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc., Interconnect Planning Corp., Interlek, Inc., International Business Services, Inc., International Computing Co., Inter Systems, Inc. (ISI).

JAYCOR, Information Systems Div. Karkar Electronics, Inc., Kearfott Div., The Singer Co., King Radio Corp., Korea Communications Engineers Co., Ltd., Korea Telecommunications Co., Ltd.

LMT Radio Professionnelle, Lexico Enterprises, Inc., LINKABIT Corp., Little, Arthur D., Program Systems Management Co., Loral Microwave Communications.

MAR, Inc., MRJ, Inc., MTS Co., Inc., Marconi Electronics, Inc., Materiel Telephonique, Le, McKay, G.E., & Company, Memorex Corp., Michigan Bell Telephone Co., Milcom Electronics Corp., Milcom Systems Corp., Miller Communications Systems Ltd., Miltope Corp., Mitel, Inc., MITRE Corp., The Motorola, Inc., Communications Group, Motorola, Inc., Government Electronics Div., Motorola GMBH, Inc., Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Co., The.

N. V. Philip Gloellampenfabrieken, Network Strategies Inc., New England Telephone & Telegraph Co., New York Telephone Co., Nippon Electric Co., Ltd., Northern Telecom, Inc., Northwestern Bell Telephone Co.

ORI, Inc., Ocean Applied Research Div. of General Indicator Corp., Old Dominion Systems Inc., Optelecom, Inc., Optronics International, Inc., Oscillatek Corp.

PRB Associates, Inc. Pace, Inc., Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Co., Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., The, Page Communications International, Inc., Panafax Corp., Parade Rest Ltd., Paradyne Corp., Perry International, Inc., Philippine Communications Satellite Corp., Plantronics Wilcom, Plessey Semiconductors, Policy Sciences Div., CACI, Inc.—Federal, Power & Electronics Personnel Service Inc., Prodelin Inc., Production Industries, Inc., Pulsecom Div. of Harvey Hubbell, Inc.

Quintron Systems, Inc. RCA American Communications, Inc., RCA Global Communications, Inc., REGCO, REL Inc., REPCO, Inc., RF Products, Inc., RFL Industries, Inc., Racal Electronics Ltd., Racal-Milgo Information Systems, Inc., Radiation Systems, Inc., Ramtek Corp., Rapicom, Inc., Raven Systems & Research Inc., Raycomm Industries, Inc., Raymond Engineering, Reaction Instruments, Inc., Roanwell Corp., Rohde & Schwarz Sales Co., Rolm Corp., Rosenberg Co., Arnold.

SAN/BAR Corp., SCI Systems Inc., SED Systems Inc., SESA-Honeywell Communica-

tions, SIGNATRON, SRI International, SRA Communications AB, STC/Communications Corp., Sabre Communications Corp., Santa Fe Corp., Satellite Business Systems, Scientific-Atlanta, Inc., Scientific Radio Systems Inc., Scientific Systems Services, Inc., Selby, Joyce, & Assoc., Selenia, S.P.A., Siemens Corp., Sierra Research Corp., Simpack Associates, Inc., Soder, Softech, Inc., South Central Bell Telephone Co., Southcom International, Inc., Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co., Southern Pacific Distributed Message Systems (SP/DMS), Southwestern Bell Telephone Co., Spargo, J., & Assoc., Sperry Division, Gyroscope, Sperry Corp., Sperry Univac Div., Sperry Corp., Sprague Electric Co., Standard Elektrik Lorenz Aktiengesellschaft (SEL), Standard Telephones & Cables Ltd., Stanford Telecommunications Inc., Stewart-Warner Electronics, Stommel Enterprises, Stoner Communications, Inc., Sunair Electronics, Inc., SysDes, Inc., Systemhouse Inc., System Planning Corporation, Systems and Applied Sciences Corp., Systems Architects, Inc., Systems Designers International Ltd., Systems Research Laboratories, Inc., Electronic Warfare Center.

T-CAS America, Inc., TIE/Communications, Inc., TRT Telecommunications Corp., TS Infosystems, Inc., Tadiran Israel Electronics Industries Ltd., Tandem Computers, Inc., TechDyn Systems Corp., Technical Materiel Corp., The, Technology Development of CA, Inc., Technology for Communications International (TCI), TECHPLAN Corp., Tecknit, Inc., Teksys, Inc., Tektronix, Inc., Telcom, Inc., Telecommunications Control Corp., Tele-Dynamics, Div. of AMBAC Industries, Inc., Teledyne Brown Engineering, a Div. of Teledyne Industries, Inc., Teletype Corp., Telex Communications, Inc., Hy-Gain/Turner Div., Telos Computing, Inc., Texas Instruments, Inc., Thomson CSF, Inc., Tii Industries, Inc., Time & Space Processing, Inc., Timeplex, Inc., Tone Commander Systems, Inc., Top Line Company, TransCanada Telephone System (TCTS), Transcom Electronics, Inc., Transtector Systems, Division of Konic International Inc., Tri-Star Electronics, Inc., Trompeter Electronics, Inc.

UNR-Rohn, Div. of UNR Industries, Inc., UTL Corp., Unger, P. T., Assoc., Unicom Systems, Inc., United States Telephone and Telegraph Corp., Universal Telecommunications Systems, Ltd.

Valtec Corp., Varian Assoc., Vega Precision Laboratories, Versitron, Inc., Vidar Div., TRW.

Wang Laboratories, Inc., Watkins-Johnson, Co., Western Telecommunications, Inc., Western Union International, Inc., Westinghouse Electric Corp., Wilcox Electric, Inc., Winkelmann Corp., Wisconsin Telephone Co.

XMCO Inc., Xebec Corp. Xerox Corp. ●

COMMEMORATING THE 64TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE BY BYELORUSSIA

HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occa-

sion to commemorate the 64th anniversary of the declaration of independence by the Byelorussian people. Officially declaring their independence as a sovereign nation on March 25, 1918, they, nevertheless, were still an enclaved nation within present day Soviet Union. Having experienced only brief periods of quasi-independence since that time, the Byelorussian people remain, against their will, under the stronghold of the Soviet Union.

The Russification policies imposed on the Byelorussians over the years have resulted in a lower ethnic percentage within their own Republic with the number of great Russians increasing. In addition, the Byelorussian Republic, along with their Baltic neighbors, is experiencing a negative population growth—perhaps as a result of their forced assimilation into the life dictated by the Soviet Government. This phenomena is not only tragic, but may have serious consequences for these people in the not so far-off future.

Despite the Russification efforts of the Soviet Government, the Byelorussians' sense of nationalism is today as strong as ever. They are ever-striving for the self-determination and sovereignty which is theoretically granted them in the U.S.S.R.'s Constitution. As a citizen of the United States—a nation founded and existing on those very principles, I would like to remind my colleagues and all people who cherish freedom and individual rights, of the brave spirit of the Byelorussian people in their effort to be free. As Americans, we have a duty to remember the courage it takes for the Byelorussians to live under Soviet rule and still strive for the preservation of their national heritage.●

DOLLARS AWAY FROM SOCIAL PROGRAM

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, little discussed by the administration is the severe economic consequences of its massive arms buildup, which will drain billions of dollars away from needed social programs. The administration must realize, as the American public is beginning to, that the best defense for the buck lies at the negotiating table.

The nuclear weapons freeze and reductions resolution Representatives CONTE, BINGHAM, and I have introduced would enable the United States to have security at the lowest possible cost. An article in the March 29 issue of *Christian Science Monitor* by former U.S. diplomat Mark Garrison shows why our resolution, which has

been introduced in the Senate by Senators KENNEDY and HATFIELD, makes good military sense and good economic sense.

NUCLEAR FREEZE: DOLLARS AND SENSE

(By Mark Garrison)

Two important political movements seem about to converge in the United States, one from the left and one from the right. The grassroots campaign for a bilateral freeze on nuclear weapons has begun to be felt in Washington, witness the joint resolution initiated by Senators Kennedy and Hatfield, cosponsored by numerous colleagues and endorsed by many private citizens. And from the other end of the spectrum, fiscal conservatives have joined moderates in advocating a cut in the rate of growth of defense spending in order to reduce projected deficits.

The nuclear weapons freeze is gaining momentum among voters from California to Vermont because it is a simple concept which answers the concerns of ordinary people about the growing danger of civilization's suicide. It gains force from a growing realization that more numerous, more powerful, and more accurate nuclear weapons will not give the U.S. more security from ordinary military pressure, and may make it even less secure from nuclear disaster.

Some who are disturbed by the Soviet military buildup may find the bipartisan freeze resolution introduced in the Congress more attractive than the freeze advocated by public groups such as the American Friends Service Committee. While the latter calls for an across-the-board freeze of all nuclear weapons and delivery systems, including medium-range weapons in Europe, the congressional resolution limits the freeze to strategic weapons. (Apparently failing to read the text of the resolution, the administration directed its criticism at the mistaken interpretation that it would simply freeze Soviet weapons in Europe.)

Unlike some other proposals, the congressional resolution envisages a negotiating route to the freeze, rather than unilateral initiatives to get it started. And, by singling out "destabilizing" weapons for special attention, it makes clear that weapons should be individually addressed in negotiations.

Although President Reagan complained that a freeze "doesn't go far enough," the congressional resolution in fact advocates that the strategic freeze be followed by "major" reductions, not limited to strategic forces and therefore embracing medium-range and even tactical weapons.

Meanwhile, prominent Republicans as well as Democrats are saying that in the face of projected budget deficits in coming years the defense budget cannot grow at the rate the administration desires. They should be listening with care to what the proponents of a nuclear freeze are saying. If nuclear "superiority" has become meaningless as well as unattainable for either side, why should we waste our money building useless weapons?

Some who have looked for savings in the strategic weapons program have concluded that, for example, eliminating the MX program would not save many billions in fiscal '83, since the heavy outlays will come later. But that should not deter those who are worried about the even larger deficits predicted for fiscal '84 and '85.

Others argue that nuclear systems are a cheap way to flex our muscles. Aside from being a dangerous cop-out, this argument is not based on sound facts. New strategic sys-

tems will not be cheap. Several are estimated by their advocates in the tens of billions of dollars, but if experience is any guide the eventual cost in some cases may be in the hundreds of billions.

Some systems which might be dropped as part of a negotiated freeze are potentially destabilizing as well as wasteful. Such as the MX missile—a tempting target if put into silos as planned. Others, such as the B-1 bomber, would not be destabilizing but might be wasteful. Sea-launched cruise missiles will not only stymie verification but could be more dangerous to the US than the Soviet Union if both sides build them, in view of America's more exposed coastal concentrations of industry and population. On the other hand, Trident submarines are expensive, but submarines are the most survivable and therefore the least destabilizing weapons and should be among the last to be frozen.

Several undertakings planned by the administration would not necessarily be banned by a strategic weapons freeze, although they could be considered for budget cutting purposes: air defenses, an expanded civil defense program, and improved command-and-control systems (which, for everyone's peace of mind, should not be significantly cut).

All of these items together might not fully meet the target for cutbacks in defense outlays called for by Senator Domenici, not to speak of Senator Hollings, especially in fiscal '83. But they would make a big dent. Every billion dollars cut from unnecessary and dangerous nuclear spending would be a billion that would not have to be cut from the muscle of conventional preparedness. And the growing ranks of Americans who feel threatened by the spiraling growth of nuclear weapons would breathe a little easier.●

EXPORT ADMINISTRATION ACT

HON. WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Speaker, recently the administration announced changes in regulations implementing the Export Administration Act which remove Iraq from the list of countries that support international terrorism. This action ends the rigorous Government controls on the export to Iraq of equipment which can easily be converted to military use.

I strongly opposed this action in a letter to the President. I believe it seriously weakens U.S. antiterrorism controls, invites the misuse of American-made equipment against friendly nations and innocent civilians and sends conflicting signals on the true nature of our policy toward international terrorism to friend and foe alike. It rewards Iraq, one of the bitterest opponents of the Camp David peace accords, with important trade concessions and ends congressional notification of commercial transactions with serious foreign policy implications,

thereby removing these transactions from public scrutiny.

In a recent article in the Washington Post, Thomas Dine, executive director of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee and Aaron Rosenbaum discuss the foreign policy implications of the administration's efforts to woo Iraq. I would like to share this article, as well as my letter to the President, with my colleagues.

Article and letter follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., March 25, 1982.

HON. RONALD REAGAN,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I write to protest the recent changes in regulations implementing Section 6-I of the Export Administration Act which remove Iraq from the list of countries which support international terrorism and permit the sale of civil aircraft to countries already on the list. I believe these actions seriously weaken U.S. anti-terrorism controls and invite the misuse of American-made equipment against friendly nations and innocent civilians.

Iraq continues to sponsor and support, both politically and monetarily, some of the most extreme and hardline participant organizations in the PLO. These groups—The Popular Democratic Front for the Liberation of Palestine, the Abu Nidal Group and the Arab Organization of the 15th of May—have claimed responsibility for numerous recent acts of terrorism. The State Department's own report on human rights mentions "credible reports of government-directed assassinations of Iraqi dissidents in other countries".

The sale of "civilian" aircraft to countries that support terrorism is an exercise in self-deception. Libya has demonstrated the military uses of such aircraft in the past. In view of the often-stated policy of this nation against international terrorism and nations that support it, I believe these changes send conflicting and confusing signals on the true nature of our policy to friend and foe alike.

I am also concerned that these actions will end Congressional notification of future sales, thereby removing them from public scrutiny.

Iraq and the other nations on the list of countries supporting terrorism are among the most vehement and vocal opponents to the Camp David peace proposals and the continued existence of our longtime friend and ally, Israel. To reward these nations with trade concessions puts corporate profits before principle and makes a sham of the Administration's stated anti-terrorist policies.

I strongly urge that the country of Iraq and civilian aircraft be restored to anti-terrorism controls, to insure a strong and continued U.S. commitment against international terrorism.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD,
Representative in Congress.

MISTAKES: BEFRIENDING IRAQ . . .

Suddenly, like the footprint Robinson Crusoe discovered, the tracks of a policy begin to appear. First came word of the victories Iranian suicide squads had achieved over Iraqi army units. Then reports of a rapprochement between the Soviets and the mullahs in Iran. Leaks to the press recounted the weapons and spare parts Iran has been able to purchase from a variety of

countries. They also documented Iran's renewed campaign to destabilize the conservative sheikdoms and kingdoms of the Persian Gulf. Then came the announcement that the United States had removed Iraq from the list of nations supporting international terrorism. Within days, a trial balloon was floated speculating on what arms and supplies the United States might now be able to provide to Iraq.

It appears that the Reagan administration is attempting to woo Iraq and to take its side in the war with Iran—a conflict that Iraq started.

Three approaches are converging; the administration's anti-Soviet drive, its move to stabilize the Persian Gulf and its approach to Arab-Israeli peace. But a tilt toward Iraq will much more likely hurt U.S. interests in these areas than promote them.

Iraq is doomed to lose its war with Iran. This is not just because the Iraqi strongman, Saddam Hussein, calculated incorrectly that the Iranian regime would collapse when he struck in September 1980. It is not just because Iraq's army has proved to be no more competent against Persians than it was against Kurds or Israelis. Rather, Iraq must lose because the Iraqis have a clear purpose verging on fanaticism: even when they were losing, the ayatollahs showed none of the pragmatism and "good sense" that are the indispensable precursors of an admission of defeat.

The current war of attrition is an empirical win, for the Iraqis know that the longer Saddam Hussein is bled in his war, the surer are the chances that the Iraqi army will overthrow him.

America's siding with Iraq, then, will not change the political outcome of the war. It will certainly not send a message to the mullahs, who demonstrated with the seizure of the American hostages their utter contempt for the United States. Favoring Iraq will give a powerful argument to Iraqis favoring closer ties to the one-time Soviet "Satan," and to Soviet diplomats now offering blandishments to suspicious mullahs. It will also give Iran a public justification for increasing its subversion of the Gulf sheikdoms.

The administration is moving toward the incredible point of rapprochement with Iraq because Washington's petrodipomatic complex of Arabists, oil executives, international contractors and bankers has succeeded in establishing an image of Iraq as "moving away from the Soviets" and "not all that radical."

Curiously, this was an early Carter administration fantasy, beginning in 1977, when the rulers in Baghdad began to make major industrial purchases in Western Europe. They also moved to replace Egypt as the leader of the Arab world—this after having led the campaign to suspend Egypt from the Arab League at the two Baghdad conferences. With the demise of the Shah and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (an event in which the U.S.S.R. used Iraqi facilities), Saddam Hussein began to publicly condemn the presence of any superpower in South Asia and the Persian Gulf.

Iraq's promoters in the United States, such as national security adviser Zbigniew Brzezinski drastically misread Saddam Hussein's intentions. Iraq opposed a Soviet presence in the Persian Gulf because Iraq itself wanted to fill the vacuum left by the Shah. Iraq's opposition to America's own policies in the area was undiminished. Iraq accepted the slightly less maximalist Arab-Israel "peace" plank at the Baghdad conferences

because it was by this means that Iraq could co-opt leadership of the Arab mainstream. In his remarks to the second conference, Saddam Hussein specifically reserved Iraq's right to oppose Israel's very existence. What he pledged was to suspend efforts to overthrow Arab regimes that publicly disagreed. This was hardly genuine moderation.

Iraq today may appear less visibly supportive of terrorism and less outspoken against Israel. This is, however, solely the product of the regime's preoccupation with both the war with Iran and Iraq's renewed effort to stir up Iraq's Shiite majority against the secular-but-Sunni Moslem ruling group of Saddam Hussein. Iraq still supports its proxy in the PLO, the terrorist Arab Liberation Front, as well as the Arab Organization of the 15th of May. Moreover, Iraq remains a violent and paranoid place. Saddam Hussein rules through terror.

In essence, Iraq represents as bad a political investment as the United States could make. Iraq cannot, will not, help us. Likely, it cannot even help itself. ●

THE SMALL BUSINESS FREE ENTERPRISE ACT

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, according to recent studies, 9 out of 10 of the new jobs created in the years ahead will be created by small businesses. But thanks to the maze of Federal regulations, the punitive tax burden, and the inflationary environment poisoned by exorbitant interest rates, it is clear that we will enjoy only a fraction of the employment opportunities and other benefits that would otherwise be provided by innovative small businesses.

In order to remove from the shoulders of our smallest businesses some of the most stifling Federal burdens, I have just introduced the Small Business Free Enterprise Act, the text of which is printed below. This bill creates no new agencies or programs, and involves no expenditures. But it would do something far more important and effective: For businesses with 20 or fewer employees, my bill would:

First, provide a 100-percent reduction in social security taxes for all qualified employees, including self-employed persons,

Second, reduce the capital gains tax to 5 percent for businesses who receive no Government subsidies or other assistance,

Third, reduce the corporate income tax to a flat 5 percent,

Fourth, allow straight line, 1 year depreciation, no maximum,

Fifth, allow cash accounting,

Sixth, eliminate minimum wage requirements, and

Seventh, eliminate the jurisdiction of OSHA.

There is every reason to believe that these reforms would give rise to a burgeoning of small, family, and community-oriented enterprises.

The qualifying criterion is simple: 20 or fewer employees. Why so simple a criterion? No one could possibly argue that a person working for so small a firm is without alternatives. In fact, subsequent to the passage of my bill, we could expect a multitude of these tiny businesses in every community. In such a competitive atmosphere, every worker would have the option of quitting and working elsewhere if he is unsatisfied with his pay or working conditions. In this environment, workers become capable, once again, of looking out for their own welfare without a mass of stifling and meddlesome Federal regulations, which destroy the alternatives open to workers, constrain the sorts of contracts they can enter into, and thus, prevent them from pursuing their own best interests. The irony in our present, depressed economy is that in our zealotry to provide for workers' welfare and happiness, we have destroyed their alternatives and their opportunities for advancement.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the following excerpt from a Time magazine article of December 21, 1981. The article discusses the Italian economy—to which our own economy bears increasing resemblance—which is largely sustained by the strength of its small business sector:

Government-subsidized industries—steel, cement, autos, shipbuilding, airlines—are losing money at a rate of \$5 million a day, partly from inefficiency, partly from political pressures . . .

The drain on the economy from such losses would be considerably worse were it not for the nation of profit. Small business everywhere is surprisingly strong. In the Tuscan city of Prato (pop. 160,000), for instance, the profits of family owned textile businesses amounted to \$1.5 billion last year . . . Prato has 15,000 factories, of which 13,000 employ ten or fewer people. The yellow-stucco houses present strange sights: family wash hangs out of the upstairs window, while lower floors are filled with spindles, looms, and dye vats . . .

The most amazing sector of the nation of profit, however, is Italy's underground economy, which never shows up on the official statistics. It is a result of the scala mobile, the official wage scale that moves up or down with cost of living indices. Most moves have been up, of course, particularly after the three powerful national labor unions won drastically higher revisions in the wage scale in 1975. Employers responded by taking advantage of a section of the labor law that exempts companies with fewer than 20 workers not only from automatic wage increases but also from compliance with regulations on benefits, safety rules, and social security. Suddenly, larger companies were chopped into smaller ones. In many cases, workers defied their unions and helped with the chopping. They did so, explains Vito Scalo, a Christian Democratic member of Parliament and one time union

leader, because workers believe that unions are out of date. Says Scalo: "They still insist on representing a proletariat that insists on growing out of the proletariat class and become entrepreneurs."

One result of such industrial miniaturization was a 30 percent reduction in labor costs. Another has been a patchwork of local boomlets. In desperately poor Naples, back-alley businesses have grown so fast that Mayor Maurizio Valenzi can brag: "Naples exports 5 million pairs of gloves a year, yet we do not have a single glove factory." In the village of Paganico Sabino (pop. 450), a farming hamlet 50 miles northwest of Rome, the women sit together in the sun, gossiping and knitting while their men work in the fields. The knitting needles fly purely for profit; the women are working for Armani, Missoni, Fiorucci and other top designers. Once a fortnight, a designer's representative collects completed knitwear and drops off a new supply of wool—and crisp lira notes. No talk about working conditions, tax deductions, or social security.

Such activities show up nowhere in official economic surveys, but they are substantial. At least a million people are employed in unreported businesses. A million others hold two jobs, one of them also unreported. An additional 300,000 Italians are self-employed. About 15 percent of the labor force, as a result, does not officially exist—and neither do its revenues. In the view of some economists, Italy's gross national product, estimated at \$393 billion in 1980, has been understated by as much as 30 percent.

This strange new version of *il piccolo e bello* (small is beautiful), has forced social scientists to do some rethinking. Explains University of Rome Sociologist Franco Ferrarotti: "In the 1960s we predicted that the Italian family was disappearing. We were absolutely wrong . . ."

I believe that this brief excerpt illustrates the sort of benefits that my bill would provide: A burgeoning of small, innovative enterprises, and all on a human scale. I would much prefer to extend these benefits over the whole of the economy, to businesses of any size. But since this seems impossible at present, I would ask my colleagues to at least permit our smallest businesses to be bastions of free enterprise. The only alternative is continued economic decline and stagnation.

The specific provisions of my Small Business Free Enterprise Act are lifted directly from the Free Enterprise Zone Act that I introduced in the last Congress. Most of the benefits that would have been provided within the zones of the old bill would now be made available to qualified small businesses. This new bill certainly could be seen as a complement to the enterprise zone legislation which has been proposed by the administration. However, I should point out that the constitutional requirement of uniform taxation raises certain questions about an enterprise zone bill which would not arise on a small business bill. This is why I have changed the orientation of my bill. I have no doubt that my new bill would still provide a significant stimulus to the economies of our poorest cities, without confining the benefits to these areas.

The text of the Small Business Free Enterprise Act follows:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; AMENDMENT OF 1954 CODE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Small Business Free Enterprise Act".

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1954 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

TITLE I—INCENTIVES

Subtitle A—Social Security Tax Reduction

SEC. 101. REDUCTION IN SOCIAL SECURITY PAYROLL TAXES.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Subchapter C of chapter 21 (relating to social security payroll taxes) is amended by redesignating section 3126 as section 3127 and by inserting after section 3125 the following new section:

"SEC. 3126. ELIMINATION OF EMPLOYEE AND EMPLOYER TAXES FOR EMPLOYEES OF QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESSES.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—If an employee is an eligible employee for any payroll period, each rate of tax specified in section 3101 or 3111 shall, for wages paid for such payroll period, be reduced by 100 percent.

"(b) ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEE.—For purposes of subsection (a), an employee is an eligible employee for any payroll period if his employer is a qualified small business (within the meaning of section 1201(d)(2)) for such period."

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter C of chapter 21 is amended by striking out the item relating to section 3126 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 3126. Reduction in employee and employer taxes for employees of qualified small businesses.

"Sec. 3127. Short title."

Subtitle B—Reduction in Capital Gain Tax Rates

SEC. 111. CORPORATIONS.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Subsection (a) of section 1201 (relating to alternative tax for corporations) is amended by striking out paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) a tax computed on the taxable income reduced by the amount of the net capital gain, at the rates and in the manner as if this subsection had not been enacted,

"(2) a tax of 5 percent of the lesser of—

"(A) the net capital gain, or

"(B) the net capital gain determined by only taking into account sales or exchanges of qualified property, plus

"(3) a tax of 28 percent of the excess (if any) of—

"(A) the net capital gain for the taxable year,

"(B) the amount of the net capital gain taken into account under paragraph (2)."

(b) DEFINITION OF QUALIFIED PROPERTY.—Section 1201 is amended by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e) and by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

"(d) DEFINITION OF QUALIFIED PROPERTY.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'qualified property' means—

"(A) any tangible property which was used predominantly by an entity in the active conduct of a trade or business, and

"(B) any interest in a corporation, partnership, or other entity,

if, for the most recent taxable year of such entity ending before the date of the sale or exchange, such entity was a qualified small business.

"(2) QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESS.—A person shall be treated as a qualified small business for any taxable year if—

"(A) such person is actively engaged in the conduct of a trade or business during such taxable year,

"(B) such person has at no time during such year more than 20 employees, and

"(C) such person receives no subsidies, grants, loans, or loan guarantees from federal, state or local governments for such taxable year."

SEC. 112. TAXPAYERS OTHER THAN CORPORATIONS.

Subsection (a) of section 1202 (relating to deduction for capital gains) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) DEDUCTION ALLOWED.—If for any taxable year a taxpayer other than a corporation has a net capital gain, there shall be allowed as a deduction from gross income—

"(1) an amount equal to the lesser of—

"(A) the net capital gain, or

"(B) the net capital gain determined by only taking into account sales or exchanges of qualified property (within the meaning of section 1201(d)), plus

"(2) 60 percent of the excess (if any) of—

"(A) the net capital gain for the taxable year, over

"(B) the amount of the net capital gain taken into account under paragraph (1)."

SEC. 113. MINIMUM TAX.

Paragraph (9) of section 57(a) (relating to tax preference for capital gains) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(E) SALES OF CERTAIN PROPERTY NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—For purposes of this paragraph, sales or exchanges of qualified property (as defined in section 1201(d)) shall not be taken into account."

Subtitle C—Corporate Rate Reduction

SEC. 121. RATE REDUCTION.

Section 11 (relating to tax imposed on corporations) is amended by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"(c) REDUCTION IN RATE OF TAX FOR CORPORATIONS WHICH ARE QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESSES.—If any corporation is a qualified small business (as defined in section 1201(d)(2)) for any taxable year, the amount of the tax imposed by subsection (a) on the taxable income of such corporation shall (in lieu of the amount determined under subsection (b)) be 5 percent."

Subtitle D—Other Incentives

SEC. 131. ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION.

(a) ONE YEAR, STRAIGHT LINE METHOD.—Section 167 (relating to depreciation) is amended by redesignating subsection (r) as subsection (s) and by inserting after subsection (q) the following new subsection:

"(r) RAPID DEPRECIATION FOR QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESSES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxpayer who is a qualified small business (within the meaning of section 1201(d)(2)) for any taxable year, the taxpayer may elect to compute the depreciation deduction

under this section with respect to any property placed in service during such taxable year by using the straight line method with a useful life of 1 year.

"(2) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 168.—Property to which an election under this subsection is in effect shall not be treated for purposes of this title as recovery property (within the meaning of section 168)."

(b) FULL INVESTMENT CREDIT ALLOWED.—Subsection (c) of section 46 (relating to qualified investment) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(10) SPECIAL RULE FOR PROPERTY OF QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the useful life, for purposes of this subpart, of any property with respect to which an election is in effect under section 167(r) shall be determined without regard to that election."

SEC. 132. OPTIONAL CASH METHOD OF ACCOUNTING FOR QUALIFIED BUSINESSES.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Section 446 (relating to general rule for methods of accounting) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) OPTIONAL CASH METHOD.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Any taxpayer who is a qualified small business (as defined in section 1201(d)(2)) for any taxable year may elect to compute taxable income—

"(A) under the cash receipts and disbursements method of accounting, and

"(B) without any requirement to use inventories under section 471.

"(2) ELECTION.—An election under paragraph (1) may be made by any taxpayer without the consent of the Secretary for the taxpayer's first taxable year for which the taxpayer is a qualified small business."

SEC. 133. MITIGATION OF MINIMUM WAGE LAWS.

The Federal laws mandating a minimum wage shall not apply to any business and its employees for the period such business is a qualified small business (within the meaning of section 1201(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954).

SEC. 134. MITIGATION OF OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION JURISDICTION.

The Occupational Safety and Health Act (and the rules and regulations issued pursuant to its authority) shall not apply to any business and its employees for the period such business is a qualified small business (within the meaning of section 1201(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954).

TITLE II—EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 201. EFFECTIVE DATES.

The amendments made by this Act—

(1) insofar as they relate to subtitle A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1982; and

(2) insofar as they relate to chapter 21 of such Code, shall apply to wages paid after December 31, 1982.●

COMMUNITY HELMSMAN HONORED

HON. RON de LUGO

OF THE U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, the residents of Frenchtown and St. Thomas recently honored one of their own, Mr.

Allan Richardson, who has been at the community's helm for 15 years. Mr. Richardson was presented with the first annual "Appreciation Award" by the Frenchtown Civic Organization.

I bring this event to the attention of this body, because I feel that Mr. Richardson is an example for and an inspiration to his fellow volunteers across this great country. The activities of this man are indicative of the facts that giving of one's self and voluntarism is alive and well in America.

The youth of St. Thomas are the true beneficiaries of Mr. Richardson's dedication. His work with the Boy Scouts has taken him throughout the St. Thomas community and touched many young people. In addition, he has encouraged parents and children to communicate in order to share and transmit their rich heritage and culture. Mr. Richardson, along with other planners in Frenchtown, are planning to revive some of the old French games they played as children and teach them to their own children in pursuit of their cultural objective.

Mr. Richardson certainly has demonstrated determination and commitment in achieving his goal—regardless of the obstacles. He founded the Moby Dick Carnival Troupe which has been a staple of the St. Thomas Carnival for many years. Mr. Richardson also contributed to the expansion of the annual Father's Day celebration into a mini-carnival. The final development of the Joseph Aubain Ballpark can be listed in this outstanding citizen's credits.

It is clear that Mr. Richardson has given of himself to better the community in which he lives. The citizens of Frenchtown and St. Thomas gathered to show their appreciation for his selfless giving. Voltaire, the great French philosopher, has said that "appreciation is a wonderful thing; it makes what is excellent in others belong to us as well." Truly, the selfless giving of Mr. Richardson belongs to us all.●

NUCLEAR ARMS

HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1982

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add these thoughts to the debate we have had during the nuclear arms special orders. The freeze-and-reductions resolution we have introduced has received some criticism from supporters of SALT II. Let me say at the outset that I supported SALT II and I continue to support SALT II. And I also support the work of the arms controllers. I think the accomplishments of the arms controllers and the SALT II treaty are notable.

Congressman LES ASPIN, of Wisconsin, was correct in noting during this debate the distinction between the "peace movement" and the arms controllers. But what the gentleman from Wisconsin fails to realize is that the peace movement is not as starry-eyed as he portrays it. Also, the arms controllers and the SALT treaty have not achieved the resounding successes their supporters might like us to believe. A recent article by William H. Kincaid, executive director of the Arms Control Association, gives a very realistic assessment of the arms control record:

Whether measured against its own objectives or against the pace of military innovation, the record of arms control has been weak. The classic statement of the goals of arms control is that it should reduce the risk of war, limit the damage if war comes, and cut the cost of preparing for war. Substantial progress toward any of these aims is difficult to discern over the last 25 years. Notwithstanding the revisionists, any impact on strategic programs is nearly as hard to assert unequivocally. Whether viewed as a means of ensuring strategic stability or of avoiding a costly commitment to an ineffective technology or both, the ABM Treaty is the only agreement to date with a detectable effect on a deployed or developmental system. The measure which most now agree would have avoided many of the strategic problems the U.S. faces today—prohibition of multiple, independently targetable, re-entry vehicles (MIRVs)—was resolutely opposed as an unacceptable restraint on a "solution" to U.S. strategic problems. And assertions that other U.S. weapons have been designed to support arms control do not hold up under scrutiny.

As for SALT II, I would draw attention to comments made by former Under Secretary of State George Ball at a public forum on our resolution, which was held in the Senate last week by Senators KENNEDY and HATFIELD:

Our disappointing experience has clearly demonstrated that reductions of any significance or magnitude cannot be achieved under a system such as has been used in the SALT negotiations. Under that system the negotiators seek vainly to establish equivalencies of weapons systems—of their warheads, throw weights, and other recondite attributes—that in the nature of things cannot be equated. In such an effort, each side is the victim of its own competing vested interests. Each of the American services—the Army, the Navy, the Air Force—fights for a larger part of the turf—a greater share in the design and management of nuclear weapons. Each pushes hard for its own weapons system with the support of its own nuclear metaphysicians and engages in reciprocal back scratching to achieve that end. If SALT II proved anything, it was that a negotiation seeking to satisfy all competitive interests is totally unsuited to achieving effective reductions. After American negotiators have accommodated all these competing

baronies and developed a negotiating position complete with fallbacks, they will have jettisoned all possibility of serious progress toward arms reduction.

I would also like to address the Jackson-Warner resolution in the Senate.

The resolution says:

The United States should propose to the Soviet Union a long-term, mutual and verifiable nuclear forces freeze at equal and sharply reduced levels of forces.

This resolution does not call for a freeze. What it calls for is a completion of the arms race and then later on beginning a freeze and deep cuts. The problem is that the arms race can never be completed. It is a never-ending process. Both sides will just keep on adding bargaining chips to the table. In the end, we just have more weapons that make it more difficult to negotiate a cut.

Calling for a long-term freeze is just the same old tired line of "let me arm, so we can disarm later." History has shown that this becomes a never-ending race:

When we exploded the Hiroshima bomb in 1945, the Soviets exploded one in 4 years.

When we deployed the intercontinental bomber in 1955, the Soviets soon followed suit.

We exploded the hydrogen bomb in 1955. The Soviets exploded one a year later.

The Soviets tested an ICBM in 1957. We tested one a year later.

The Soviets launched Sputnik I in 1957. We launched our first satellite a year later.

We produced our first Polaris sub in 1960. The Soviets produced a comparable sub in 1968.

The United States produced multiple warheads (MRV's) in 1966. The Soviets had them 2 years later.

The Soviets deployed 64 defensive missiles around Moscow in 1968. We began construction of an ABM system in 1969.

We MIRV'd our warheads beginning in 1970. The Soviets began deploying MIRV's 5 years later.

The United States is developing cruise missiles. The Soviets, no doubt, will follow suit.

The Jackson-Warner resolution would insure that history keeps on repeating itself, and repeating itself, until we end up blowing ourselves off the face of the Earth.●

WATT'S NEW ATTACK ON WILDERNESS

HON. MARTIN OLAV SABO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, there is presently active debate occurring on

the question of whether mining and drilling should be permitted in wilderness areas. In a surprising move, Secretary Watt introduced a bill, the stated purpose of which is to protect these lands until the end of the century. However, its effects will be quite the contrary.

An editorial appeared in the Minneapolis Tribune on March 1, 1982, explaining the situation and the nature of Secretary Watt's latest action. I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WATT'S NEW ATTACK ON WILDERNESS

When Interior Secretary James Watt says he wants to protect wilderness areas from mining and drilling for the rest of this century, environmentalists rightly wonder if there's a catch. There are several. Watt's proposal is a clever flanking attack on the wilderness system. It should be rejected. Congress should move soon to prohibit permanently any further leasing in existing federal wilderness areas.

If Watt were interested in preserving wilderness from mining and drilling, he would not need complex new legislation. At most, he would need a simple amendment to the Wilderness Act. The Act permanently closes wilderness areas to mineral leases at the end of 1983. Watt has imposed a moratorium on leases through 1982. Thus, only during 1983 may further leases be granted. If Watt had environmental interests at heart he possibly could close that one-year window by extending his own moratorium. Should he want legislative endorsement, Congress would oblige.

But Watt isn't acting from concern for wilderness, and he doesn't want that lease window closed. He would like to grant, not prohibit, wilderness-area leases to the mining and energy interests that now have 1,000 applications pending. Congress has frustrated every effort in that direction. One so angered Rep. Manuel Lujan, Jr. of New Mexico, ranking Republican on the House Interior Committee, that Watt was forced to impose the present leasing moratorium. He got the message: Don't mess with wilderness areas.

With Congress disinclined to allow further wilderness leasing before the 1983 deadline, and the Wilderness Act providing permanent protection thereafter, Watt concedes nothing by offering to protect wilderness through the end of the century. In effect, he proposes to substitute temporary wilderness protection for the permanent protection that is already fairly well assured.

Watt also would weaken the limited protection he offers. He proposes that the president be empowered to open wilderness areas for mining by declaring a national emergency. The president would define national emergency. Congress could overrule, but only by action of both houses with 60 days. The change is an unnecessary, subversive attack on the wilderness system. Under the existing Wilderness Act, the president at any time can ask Congress to lift the wilderness designation, and Congress, if convinced by the president's arguments, can oblige. In a true national emergency it is inconceivable that Congress would refuse. But the burden of proof rightly should rest, as it now does with those who want to disturb an existing wilderness, not with those who favor continued protection.

Watt's proposal does not represent a change of heart; only a change in tactics. Because he cannot work his will constraints of the existing Wilderness Act, he now seeks to change the act. Congress should reject his play.●

PURPLE HEART CELEBRATES 50-YEAR ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. WILLIAM J. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate the 250th anniversary of George Washington's birth, we should also pause to remember the anniversary of a military medal which traces its origins to him—the Purple Heart.

This combat decoration, awarded to those wounded by the enemy in time of war, and given posthumously to next of kin in the name of those killed in action, had a 50-year anniversary of its own which coincided with Washington's birthday this year.

On February 22, 1932—the 200th anniversary of Washington's birth—the War Department revived a citation created by the general in Newburgh, N.Y., on August 7, 1782. Only three people actually received Washington's "Badge of Military Merit," and poor recordkeeping resulted in its disuse until research for the 1932 Washington Bicentennial renewed interest. The War Department established the Order of the Purple Heart for Military Merit, authorizing a badge with a likeness of Washington in bronze on purple enamel with a light bronze border.

In recognition of the 50-year anniversary of that action, I would like to share with my colleagues an article, "The Purple Heart Story," which appeared in the Jewish War Veterans Magazine.

THE PURPLE HEART STORY

The order of the Purple Heart for military merit, commonly called "The Purple Heart," is an American decoration—the oldest military decoration in the world in present use and the first award made available to a common soldier. It was created by one of the world's most famed and best-loved heroes—General George Washington!

General Washington is often pictured as a cold, stern soldier, a proud aristocrat, a martinet. Perhaps he was all of these at times. Yet, we know he showed sympathy and concern for his troops, and was not too proud to pray, humbly on his knees, for his beloved country and for the men who served it, and him, so bravely and loyally. His keen appreciation of the importance of the common soldier in any campaign impelled him to recognize outstanding valor and merit by granting a commission or an advance in rank for the person concerned. In the summer of 1782 he was ordered by the Continental Congress to cease doing so—there were no funds to pay the soldiers, much less the officers!

Deprived of his usual means of reward, he must have searched for a substitute. Shortly after receiving the "stop" order from Congress, he wrote his memorable General Orders of August 7, 1782, which read in part as follows:

"The General, ever desirous to cherish virtuous ambition in his soldiers, as well as foster and encourage every species of military merit, directs that whenever a singularly meritorious action is performed, the author of it shall be permitted to wear on his facings, over his left breast, the figure of a heart in purple cloth or silk edged with narrow lace binding. Not only instances of unusual gallantry but also of extraordinary fidelity and essential service in any way shall meet with due reward. . . . The name and regiment of the persons so certified are to be enrolled in a Book of Merit which shall be kept in the orderly room. . . . Men who have merited this distinction to be suffered to pass all guards and sentinels which officers are permitted to do. . . . The road to glory in a patriot army and a free country is thus open to all."

Lost or misfiled for almost 150 years among War Department Records at Washington, D.C., this important paper came to light during the search for Washington's papers prior to the celebration of his Bicentennial in 1932. With it were the dramatic accounts of three soldiers who received the decoration at Newburgh, N.Y., at Washington's Headquarters. The Book of Merit has not been found. The U.S. War Department revived the Purple Heart decoration on February 22, 1932. The revived form is of metal, instead of perishable cloth, made in the shape of a rich purple heart bordered with gold, with a bust of Washington in the center and the Washington coat-of-arms at the top. The latter is believed to have been the source of the stars and stripes of the American Flag.

Intrinsically, the Purple Heart is the world's costliest military decoration—nineteen operations are required to make it from the rough heart stamped from bronze to the finished medal, plated with gold and enameled in various colors, suspended from a purple and white ribbon.

The Order of the Purple Heart is awarded to members of the armed forces of the U.S. who are wounded by an instrument of war in the hands of an enemy and posthumously to the next of kin in the name of those who are killed in action or die of wounds received in action. It is definitely a combat decoration.

An organization now known as "The Military Order of the Purple Heart," was formed in 1932 for the protection and mutual interest of all who have received the decoration. Composed exclusively of Purple Heart recipients, it is the only strictly "combat" organization extant.

Funds for welfare, rehabilitation and/or service work carried on by the organization are derived almost entirely from the annual distribution of its official flower, the Purple Heart Viola. These are assembled by disabled and needy veterans, many of whom receive little or no compensation from other sources. Thus, your contribution for a Viola serves a two-fold purpose—it helps the veteran who assembled it, and it enables the organization to do many things in behalf of hospitalized and needy veterans and their families.

The Purple Heart Viola on your lapel is evidence that you have not forgotten the price of liberty paid in the past and still being paid by those who have borne the brunt of battle in defense of America.

Close feminine relatives of Purple Heart recipients are eligible to belong to the Ladies Auxiliary of The Military Order of the Purple Heart, which does important work nationally and locally in Veterans' Hospitals. Further information about the Order and its Auxiliary may be obtained by writing: The Military Order of the Purple Heart, National Headquarters, Rosslyn, Box 9286, Arlington, Virginia 22209.●

LAST HIRED FIRST TO GO

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, our country is facing the highest unemployment rate it has experienced in decades. Loss of jobs is creating hardship for individuals and families everywhere. There is one group that is suffering disproportionately. They are the women and minority workers who were the last hired and are the first being fired. Many of these now laid-off workers were providing a crucial second income to their family, and many were the sole source of income for themselves and their families.

I would like to insert an article from the March 31 Baltimore Evening Sun which expresses, in very personal terms, the effects these layoffs are having on women in Baltimore. We must not lose sight of the effect that current economic policy is having on the individuals and families we are here to represent.

[From the Baltimore Evening Sun, Mar. 31, 1982]

POINT IDLING 2,000; WOMEN GONE AT GM

(By Stacie Knable)

Once there were 800 women hanging tires and sanding autos at Baltimore's General Motors Corp. assembly plant.

Now there are none.

In September, more than 10 years after hiring its first female assembly-line worker, GM's local plant laid off its last female line worker. Women now represent about one-fourth of all hourly workers on furlough at the Broening Highway plant, victims of a seniority system which prunes newest employees first.

For many of the women, building Chevrolets and Pontiacs was like a long love affair. Occasionally you grow sick and tired and desperately want to get out, but the security is just too sweet.

"I really liked my job. It gets boring, but I loved my job," says Ann Latham, laid off last September after 10 years at GM. "I felt I had it made. It offered really great benefits."

For Latham, a divorced mother of four, acceptance by the male autoworker came quickly.

"So many of them went out of their way to make me feel welcome, because I was just plain scared to death. I had no idea I could do it. I figured I'd be in there for an hour and they'd fire me," says 42-year-old Latham.

Rod Trump, vice president of Local 239 of the United Auto Workers, empathizes with the Baltimore autoworkers hurt by slumping car sales. And he realizes that the female work force has been hurt worst: "There is no question that hard times have wiped out the affirmative action program."

"But the biggest impact was on the young, whether female, black or yellow. The people that had babies to feed and houses to keep . . . everything was snuffed out," he said.

Carol Bonosaro, assistant staff director for congressional and public affairs at the U.S. Civil Rights Commission in Washington, agrees that hard economic times hurt women workers.

"It is quite clear that the greatest impact has been on women as a group and then minorities. This is logical, as women's participation in the work-force has been increasing each year," says Bonosaro. "What is happening there [government] is probably happening in other industries where seniority is the criterion."

Bonosaro notes that the weakening economy "will probably put affirmative action back a few steps, although vacancies do occur, even in a nongrowing economy."

Bonosaro adds that women subject to economic woes and layoffs will become more politically active, gaining "heightened sensitivity to economic issues. That certainly will be an issue to watch."

The purge of women at GM here seemed as remote a possibility as contract concessions in October 1979, when Rod Trump says "everything was wonderful."

Three months later, the long rash of layoffs began as 2,000 second-shift workers were furloughed. That affected the majority of the women, who were relegated to second-shift duty as men with generally higher seniority preferred day-shift work, according to Jack Summers, personnel director at the Southeast Baltimore facility.

Linda Thrappas remembers screwing on bumper brackets and clamping battery cables on the night shift Monday through Friday, sometimes on Saturday, in 1972. The hours weren't perfect, but GM was revving right along then—job security didn't require concessions and the plant didn't close regularly, as it already has seven weeks this year for "inventory adjustments."

Thrappas, 30, hated her job so much that "it was a relief to be laid off" last September.

"It's a money trap. It's excellent pay, and there's nothing else you can do, without skills, that pays anything close," says Thrappas, who worked on the chassis line while pregnant in 1973.

Returning to GM after maternity leave, Thrappas says she was reassigned to a much more demanding job: "They put me on a job that I just couldn't do. I had to load about a 40-pound muffler on the car, one every minute. There wasn't a man on the line who would do that job if he could help it."

Thrappas began hemorrhaging and was hospitalized, but she later returned to the same job.

"I'd just sit and cry on my breaks. Finally, I fussed so much, raised so much hell, that they transferred me to another job," she says.

While Thrappas found building cars side by side with men not always easy, she recalls many helping hands when her co-workers realized she struggled to do her job: "The men would come and do my work for five or 10 minutes just to give me a break. Once you're a part of a group and you're

being [taken advantage of], you're a part of them. All of the workers are together."

One of Thrappas's fellow assemblers was her husband, also laid off in September. The couple is now divorced, and Linda Thrappas attributes much of the problem to working at GM.

"The biggest factor is financial disaster. He couldn't accept the fact that we'd have to have a different lifestyle," says Thrappas.

Thrappas plans to complete studies for a nursing degree, but not because she thinks GM will abandon Baltimore.

"The whole country has suffered, but I don't think GM will take the brunt of it. If GM goes under, so would the country," says Thrappas.

Gwendolyn Baylor, 31, and also unemployed, thinks she eventually will return to work at GM. Like Thrappas, she remembers when the cars rolled smoothly and quickly off the Broening Highway assembly line.

"At first, working at GM was just like going into a concentration camp. You'd go to work and you couldn't get out, because there was either so much work or else the line would stop," says Baylor.

Baylor liked her job on the truck line—and its benefits: "If not for GM, I wouldn't have been able to buy my house, my car, put braces on my son's teeth. I came from Turner Station and now I live near Sparrows Point."

POSTAL SERVICE CRITICIZED

HON. CARROLL HUBBARD, JR.

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, my constituents often write me to express their concerns about the service provided by the U.S. Postal Service. In that vein, I would like to share with my colleagues the views of one of those constituents, Rev. William J. Agee, pastor of the Northside United Methodist Church in Paducah, Ky., regarding the mail service in his own community. Mr. Speaker, I submit Reverend Agee's letter:

DEAR SIR: I am writing this letter while very angry and I might add that this anger has been white hot for the last year. It is over our supposed great Postal Service. I have never seen an organization that is given more time off, allowed to foul up more and waste more than the United States Postal Service. It is the worst organization that we have within the framework of our federal government.

Our mail service was supposed to be more efficient and better for higher rates. If anything it has gone to the dogs. We cannot get next day delivery of mail across the city of Paducah. We have a postman delivering our mail who has dropped from having the mail in the box by 1:30 p.m. till now it is 4:00 and 4:30 p.m. before we receive our mail. And then most of the time I have to take mail to people's houses three and four streets away.

Now, they are placing outrageous rates on our small membership church to mail a newsletter to our members to keep many of them who are shut-ins abreast of what is happening in the church. I serve as the District Director of Church and Society for this

district. I am strongly looking at mounting a campaign to see if we cannot get someone in office from our state who will represent us against President Reagan. If you cannot start turning some of this around, maybe we can in the future find some new blood to bring leadership to Washington and the government. This postal department would be an excellent starting place.

Grace and Peace,

WILLIAM J. AGEE, Pastor. ●

VIRGIN ISLANDER RECEIVES RAFI AHMED KIDWAI AWARD

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, the director of land grant programs at the College of the Virgin Islands was recently named the recipient of India's highest award for agricultural research. Dr. Darshan S. Padda received the prestigious Rafi Ahmed Kidwai Award which is given every 2 years by the Government of India for his "outstanding work in agricultural research."

The people of the U.S. Virgin Islands and the College of the Virgin Islands are very proud of Dr. Padda for this recognition. Dr. Arthur A. Richards, president of the College of the Virgin Islands summed it up when he said:

This not only reflects the excellent quality of the College's personnel but also demonstrates the high level of expertise that we possess at our institution for undertaking international work.

Since Dr. Padda was unable to attend the award function in India, arrangements are being made for him to receive the award from the Indian Ambassador in Washington, D.C. The award consists of a check, a certificate, and a citation.

Dr. Padda has been a resident of St. Croix for more than 10 years and is employed by the College of the Virgin Islands as the director of the college's agricultural experiment station and the cooperative extension service. He received his Ph. D. in plant breeding from Cornell University and has done research and teaching in India and Florida before coming to the U.S. Virgin Islands.

Dr. Padda's previous honors include recognition by the American Society of Horticultural Science for his work on physiological genetics of beans, a distinguished service award for his work as vice president and editor of the agricultural and food fair, and a commendation plaque by the Virgin Islands Senepol Association for exceptional ingenuity and judgment in directing sound research and educational programs for the development of Senepol cattle.

He has authored more than 50 scientific publications. He is listed in the "Who's Who in World Agriculture" and is an active member in the International Society of Horticultural Science, American Society of Horticultural Science, and the Caribbean Food Crops Society.

Dr. Padda has provided exemplary service to the college and to the Virgin Islands community. Under Dr. Padda's leadership, the college's land grant programs have earned local, regional, and international reputations. The U.S. Virgin Islands certainly is fortunate to have a man of Dr. Padda's ability within its territorial boundaries.●

WATT CUTS AWAY AT WILDERNESS

HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Watt has recently proposed legislation, the stated purpose of which is to protect the wilderness from mineral leasing. An editorial appeared in the Salem Statesman-Journal on March 6, 1982, describing the legislation. I think the editorial represents how many Oregonians feel about this latest initiative out of the Secretary's office.

WATT CUTS AWAY AT WILDERNESS

Now that details are known, it can be stated that Interior Secretary James Watt's proposed "Wilderness Protection Act of 1982" is an insidious effort to undermine the Wilderness Act of 1964.

The provisions of his new legislation justify suspicions of Watt's motives in offering to abandon his campaign to sell mining leases in the wilderness.

While the bill purports to delay all mineral development in the wilderness until the year 2000, it would allow the president, acting unilaterally, to authorize development in the wilderness by declaring an "urgent national need." At present, wilderness designation cannot be altered without congressional approval.

The bill would transform the permanent prohibition on mineral development in the wilderness, which is to take effect at the end of next year, and terminate it in the year 2000. This would include National Park wilderness as well as the wilderness on land managed by the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management.

Inventorying of wilderness for mineral resources is permitted now, as long as the wilderness character of the area is not disturbed. Under Watt's proposal, such inventorying could be expanded to use any equipment that does not require the building of roads.

With the use of helicopters, this could seriously and unnecessarily damage the wilderness character of the areas in which it occurred.

The proposed law is riddled with exemptions. For example, the wilderness protection areas in Alaska would be made available for oil and gas leasing. The present buffer areas around the wilderness would be withdrawn from protection.

One of the most distressing things about this proposed law is its "release" language. Congress, the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management have been studying the status of roadless areas for years.

Pressure is building for a final determination—wilderness or non-wilderness—on these lands. This is understandable. They are a volatile political issue.

This newspaper contends, however, it is not essential to decide the ultimate fate of all these lands now. Some should be put into forest harvest categories, with roads allowed. Some should be added to the country's stock of wilderness. The designation for much of the land should be left for future determination.

This proposed legislation would require that all roadless areas not included in the wilderness by Jan. 1, 1985 be released for uses other than wilderness. In other words, the Reagan administration, namely Watt, wants the decision made on all land before the end of its four years in office.

Whatever Watt can block from becoming wilderness in that length of time would be barred from wilderness from that time forward.

This proposal, parading under the misbegotten title of the "Wilderness Protection Act of 1982," would destroy or endanger the safeguards built around the few remaining natural regions of this country.

The best wilderness protective act we could take in 1982 is to leave the present legislation alone, so it can continue to do the task that Congress assigned to it 18 years ago.●

CALL TO CONSCIENCE VIGIL FOR SOVIET JEWRY

HON. WILLIAM M. BRODHEAD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. BRODHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleague, Congressman NORMAN LENT, in the 1982 Congressional Call to Conscience Vigil for Soviet Jewry. This is a continuing effort begun in 1976 to bring to the attention of Congress and the public the continuing plight of Soviet Jews who are being detained in the Soviet Union because of that government's restrictive emigration policies.

I sponsored the Vigil for Freedom for Soviet Jewry in 1978 as part of this effort. At that time, I spoke on behalf of Alexander and Leah Maryasin and their daughter, Faina, who at that time had, for 5 years, repeatedly been denied permission to leave the Soviet Union and emigrate to Israel to join their oldest daughter.

I am sad to say that today, 5 years later, no progress has been made in their case. I once again speak on behalf of this family. They have suffered much because of their desire to rejoin their daughter in Israel.

The Maryasins live in Riga, Latvia, and applied for exit permission in 1973. They were refused, for no stated reason. This was only the first of many such refusals.

Apparently because of his application for emigration papers, Alexander Maryasin lost his executive post at a Riga manufacturing plant. His younger daughter was expelled from the university she was attending. Since then, the family has been jobless and has been forced to sell its possessions merely to survive. A hunger strike begun to bring attention to their desperate situation was officially ignored.

Recently, Leah Maryasin became afflicted with a brain tumor and nearly died in the operation which followed. Her attempts to receive specialized medical treatment for her condition have been ignored. The Government of Canada has offered its assistance, and the Maryasins have once again applied for exit permission, this time based on medical emergency.

I earnestly hope that the Government of the Soviet Union will change its policies and help these people. They hold no state secrets and seek only to live their lives united with their daughter in Israel. The Maryasins, along with thousands of other Soviet Jews, have lost everything because of their desire to live in peace and freedom. It is my hope that this call to conscience will awaken others to their plight and strengthen our resolve to assist them.●

MINNESOTA IRON ORE MINING JOBS THREATENED BY PROPOSED BRAZILIAN ORE PROJECT AND WORLD BANK LOAN

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives a pending \$300 million loan application to the World Bank by Cia Vale do Rio Doce, a Brazilian Government-owned and controlled company. The purpose of the loan is to assist in the financing of what would be the world's largest iron ore development facility.

In my judgment this loan application is in violation of a World Bank policy which prohibits World Bank participation in projects which produce commodities already in substantial surplus in the world market.

The Carajas project, owned by C.V.R.D., is located in northern Brazil. A 1-million-ton-per-year pilot plant is nearing completion; the full-scale project is scheduled to be in operation by 1984. The Carajas project is expected to produce 15 million metric tons of iron ore for export in 1985, 25 million tons in 1986, and reach full production capacity of 35 million tons in 1987. Brazil's 1980 iron ore production was 80 million tons, while its raw steel pro-

duction was 16.8 million in that same year.

If the Carajas project is carried through to planned production capacity, Brazil's iron ore tonnage in 1987 would be in excess of 105 million tons. Its domestic needs in that same year are estimated to be 27 million tons, with 78 million tons planned for export markets.

By comparison, total U.S. iron ore production in 1980 was 69.3 million tons. The largest U.S. iron ore processing plant, United States Steel's Minntac facility at Mountain Iron, Minn., has a production capacity of 18 million tons, but last year produced only 11 million tons.

Total world production of iron ore in 1979 was 838 million tons. Reports on future production of iron ore (free world, excluding the United States and Canada) show plans totaling 60 million tons of capacity at an estimated investment of \$8.2 billion (1981 dollars) by 1987.

Development costs of the Carajas project are now estimated to be approximately \$150 per ton. Development costs for Minnesota ore production have been approximately \$50 per ton.

Because of the excess of iron ore in the world market, Brazil will be forced to subsidize production and sell the ore on the world market at prices far below production costs—in a word, dumping.

Clearly, the Carajas project will have a depressing effect upon the world market, already in excess production, and a devastating effect on the iron ore industries of the United States, Canada, Sweden, and Australia. Several iron ore facilities in those countries are now running at less than one-third of capacity and will be faced with additional cutbacks if the Carajas project is completed as scheduled.

We must put a stop to competition from competition by commodities produced abroad with the help of subsidies from foreign governments or international lending institutions. Such projects undercut the American economy and drive jobs out of the American workplace.

Mr. Speaker, I urge other Members of this House to join with the Congressional Steel Caucus in opposing the C.V.R.D. application and work vigorously for its defeat.●

HALTING THE ARMS RACE

HON. WILLIAM J. HUGHES

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, as a legislator, concerned citizen, and father of four children, I feel a strong sense of responsibility for the future

of our country and the world. We have witnessed in recent decades a massive accumulation of nuclear armaments by the two superpowers and a disturbing expansion of nuclear capability among other nations of the world. Nuclear proliferation endangers us all, for day by day it makes nuclear war both more likely, whether by design or accident, and more thinkable to those who control the weapons.

I believe that, as leaders of a country we love and would perpetuate, it is vital that we work to arrest the acceleration of the nuclear arms race. We are responsible for the fate of our Nation, and we must support a sound solution to this growing danger. We cannot act in a way which would endanger our Nation or invite others to threaten us with nuclear armaments. Rather, we must advocate a balanced approach which requires the same risks and sacrifices by both superpowers.

We must therefore look to proposals which are both mutual and verifiable. We must strongly support efforts to bring a negotiated, equitable agreement with the Soviet Union which assures our safety and which imposes the same risks and responsibilities on each nation. Whether through START talks, a nuclear freeze initiative, or other means, dialog must be pursued with a true willingness to end the arms race and reduce the nuclear arsenals of the superpowers. Increasingly, our citizens demand it and, clearly, our future depends upon it.

LENORE CULLMAN—FIRST WOMAN HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATOR IN THE LOS ANGELES HARBOR AREA

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call my colleague's attention to the fact that earlier this year, Mrs. Lenore Cullman, R.N., was appointed to the position of administrator at Bay Harbor Hospital located in Harbor City, Calif.

Some of my colleagues may ask, "Why is this of any great importance or significance?" It is because when Mrs. Cullman received this appointment, she became the first woman hospital administrator in the Los Angeles South Bay and Harbor area.

Lenore received her bachelor of arts degree and R.N. from Coe College located in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. She earned a master's degree in education from California State University at Long Beach, where she graduated with honors and was elected to the Phi Kappa Phi honor society. Currently, she is pursuing a master's degree in

health care administration. Lenore also holds a lifetime community college instructor credential from the State of California and is a member of the Hospital Council of Southern California's Directors of Nursing Council; the American Society for Nursing Service Administrators; and the National League for Nursing. She is also the chairperson of unit "E" of the California League for Nursing, and in concert with this is a member of the league's board of directors.

Immediately prior to Lenore's promotion to the administrator position, she had been serving as acting director of the Bay Harbor Hospital since November 1981. She also served as the hospital's assistant administrator for nursing and patient services for 3 years, and in this capacity was responsible for ancillary services, quality assurance/risk management programs, and dialysis operations. In addition to this, Lenore also serves on the hospital's long-range planning committee and chaired the Accreditation Committee.

Lenore's experience in the field prior to securing a position at Bay Harbor Hospital includes assignments as associate administrator for patient care services at Woodruff Community Hospital in Long Beach and Lakewood General Hospital, and as nursing administrator at Paramount General Hospital, Cerritos Gardens Hospital, and Los Alamitos General Hospital.

Lenore Cullman has earned the respect and admiration of many, not only for her involvement in community affairs, but also for the accomplishments of her professional career as a registered nurse and hospital administrator. Through her competence and persistence, she broke into a field where employment opportunities for professional women are not widespread. Her performance has truly been inspiring.

My wife, Lee, joins me in congratulating Lenore Cullman for a job well done. We extend our heartfelt best wishes and appreciation for the contributions she has made to her profession and to the people of the South Bay. We also send to her and her husband, Louis, and their children, Louis, Sally, and Laurie, our sincere hopes for a bright and prosperous future.●

HELEN UNSINN

HON. MICHAEL D. BARNES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. BARNES. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, I lost a dear friend and a devoted staff member, Mrs. Helen Unsinn. She was one of a handful of early volunteers who worked on my

first campaign, and she later became a bulwark of strength and dependability in my congressional office in Wheaton, Md. While we honor many great Americans in these pages, Helen, in her quiet way, epitomized what it means to care about one's country and to look after one's neighbor more than anyone I can think of—simply through living it, day by day.

As a final gift to Helen, I would like to submit for the RECORD the eulogy which I gave at her funeral:

The shock and sadness of losing Helen—the dearest, most selfless person many of us will ever know—brings us together today. Helen was a genuine friend to all of us.

Helen was, for her many friends, a person who was just always there—not imposing herself on anyone, not asking for anything, not making a scene—just there, doing whatever needed doing. In a world where everyone wants to be a chief, Helen was proud to serve as an Indian.

I first remember Helen, and Otto, from our days working together for the National Democratic Forum, an organization that tried to raise important national issues in the Democratic Party.

Typically, Helen was a volunteer. She was, always, a quiet, loyal worker, involved because she cared about her country and wanted, in her unassuming way, to make a contribution to its future.

When I decided to run for the U.S. House of Representatives, a decision many people thought was crazy at the time, Helen was there from the very beginning.

There are a very few people without whom there would never have been a Congressman Barnes.

Helen is one of those.

Her first job in my campaign was to put the names of friends and potential supporters onto 3 x 5 index cards and keep them filed. Our first file was a shoe box from a pair of shoes that belonged to my daughter Dillon. As Helen expanded the file, we gradually grew into other shoe boxes.

Helen joined Claudia and me and Kathy Carroll every day in Marie Bass's dark basement in Silver Spring for months. She treated that volunteer "job" just as she would have any other. She was dependable, on time, always there because she knew we needed her.

Gradually the campaign attracted other people, and we moved to a real office. We had a lot of shoe boxes with 3 x 5 cards. Helen still kept track of each one meticulously.

When I got elected—it was a shock to many people, but Helen said she had known all along I would—I was in a position for the first time to offer some rewards and favors, a few jobs. Helen asked me for nothing. And when I asked her what I could do for her, whether she would like one of the jobs, she said she'd just like to continue to volunteer some in my office, whatever needed doing.

I remember our first conversation about what she might do in my office. Couldn't she just continue taking care of the card files, she asked? I explained that we'd been able to put all those names and addresses on a computer, and that we didn't have to bother with all those 3 x 5 cards and shoe boxes anymore.

She looked a little downcast for a moment. I think she thought there might not be a role for her anymore. Which was, of course, the furthest thing from the truth.

She began working in my office, first two days a week, then three days a week. At first, she answered telephones and dealt with miscellaneous constituent problems that people called or wrote to me about. Gradually, she began to specialize in Social Security problems, especially the very difficult area of Social Security disability—where people who are in ill health and unable to continue to work apply through the Social Security system for disability benefits.

It is unfortunately routine for many of these applicants to be denied once, sometimes twice, before they finally have the opportunity to appear before a judge and have a greater chance of being accepted. This process can take months or longer, and, in the meantime, people can no longer work, they are without money, in ill health, and in many cases, very desperate. Helen counseled and held the hand of literally hundreds of such people. She learned the process thoroughly and while it was not appropriate for my office to try to influence a decision on a person's application, Helen kept track of the application as it made its way through Social Security, made sure the papers were filed properly, the medical reports were submitted. She acted as a liaison between doctors, their patients, the Social Security staff, whatever was necessary.

One case involved a 34-year-old man with a brain tumor. He had a wife and two small children. He had been able to care for them well, but when he got sick, he lost his job and eventually his benefits were exhausted. With his huge medical bills, his family's reserves quickly dwindled. He was desperate and depressed. Throughout the long months before his disability benefits were finally granted, Helen talked with this man and his wife on almost a daily basis. Helen suffered with them, and they clung to Helen.

Many others clung to Helen, too. I have received many, many beautiful letters from people unknown to me who thanked me for having Helen in my office and for what she did for them. People learned the hours and the days when Helen would be in the office; they did not hesitate to call her about anything. Helen even gave her home telephone number and told people to call her at home when they couldn't reach her in the office.

It is hard to imagine the corner of the big workroom in the Wheaton office without Helen—papers and files piled around her—on the telephone, her head down, deep in conversation with a troubled constituent.

It is hard to imagine a campaign without Helen. It's hard to picture coming into a fundraiser or a big event without Helen sitting at the front table signing everybody in, as she has always done, since my very first campaign event in September of 1977, since the early days of the National Democratic Forum, back in 1973 or '74, when Helen would register everyone and Otto would take the money.

There was no pretention or arrogance in Helen. She didn't work to make you like her. She only asked that people take her as she was. Her single ambition was to always give as much as she could—and then ask what more she could do. It might have been possible sometimes to forget Helen was there, because there was no fanfare about her. But then every once in a while, there would be a sudden explosion of laughter that was *only* Helen's—and we knew Helen was there. And of course whatever job she had been asked to do, got done, and done well.

To you, Otto, on behalf of Helen's many, many friends, on behalf of Claudia and my parents, on behalf of the Wheaton staff, the Capitol Hill staff, all the people associated with my campaigns and with the Democratic party in Montgomery County, I want to extend our heartfelt sympathy. We extend our hands and hearts also to you, Patricia and Victor and Daniel. We offer our help to you and other members of the family in any way possible in the coming weeks and months. I hope that we've been able to convey to you how much we share your grief.

While they are not here today, we want Helen's granddaughters to know of our love one day too—Helen, Summer, Alicia and Susan. She loved them above all else. She loved to be asked about them, to show their pictures, even to brag a little about them. For all of us in this room with small children, Helen was a surrogate grandmother, and none of us will ever forget her many gestures of love to our children.

One small example of that was a book that Helen gave to my daughter, Dillon, who is now six years old. A book of poetry by Shel Silverstein, it is called "Where the Sidewalk Ends." I'd like to read today a little of the poetry that Helen shared with my daughter and, I know, with other children:

NO DIFFERENCE

Small as a peanut,
Big as a giant,
We're all the same size
When we turn off the light.
Rich as a sultan,
Poor as a mite,
We're all worth the same
When we turn off the light.
Red, black or orange,
Yellow or white,
We all look the same
When we turn off the light.
So maybe the way
To make everything right
Is for God to just reach out
And turn off the light!

FORGOTTEN LANGUAGE

Once I spoke the language of the flowers,
Once I understood each word the caterpillar said,
Once I smiled in secret at the gossip of the starlings,
And shared a conversation with the housefly in my bed.
Once I heard and answered all the questions of the crickets,
And joined the crying of each falling dying flake of snow,
Once I spoke the language of the flowers
...
How did it go?
How did it go?

It is so appropriate that the family wishes contributions in Helen's memory to go to Children's Hospital.

Finally, dear Helen, we will—after today—continue to refer to you as all of us often have in the past. But when we do, we will know that you are now among others like you and worthy of you.

We love you, Helen. We have never had a better friend.●

A TRIBUTE TO EDWARD
"BROWNIE" TALERICO

HON. DONALD J. MITCHELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. MITCHELL of New York. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring the attention of my colleagues to the distinguished accomplishments of Edward "Brownie" Talerico, of Utica, N.Y. On April 24, Branch 375 of the National Association of Letter Carriers will honor Brownie Talerico in recognition of his 20th year as branch president.

In addition, he has served for 10 years as a member of the New York State executive board. He is area local business agent. He has served on several national committees including the prestigious National Ratification Committee. He is the founder and editor of the award-winning Utica Letter Carriers Journal.

He is an active and dedicated member of his community. He is a recipient of the Boy's Club Golden Boy Award. He is a sponsor of the branch's hospital program for terminally ill children. He was an active participant of my Business Assistance Committee, an effort to coordinate the energies of business, labor, and government in area economic development endeavors. He is president of the Utica Columbian Association, a member of chapter 182 of the Disabled American Veterans, the Moose, and New York Senators Club.

A veteran of World War II, he served in the Pacific theater as a rifleman. He was nicknamed "Brownie" after a short ring career in the days of amateur bootleg boxing.

An active union member since his early years, he was a member of Local 440 of the Iron Workers Union and the Carpenters Union Local 125. He is a branch delegate to the Central New York AFL-CIO.

On the 20th anniversary of his presidency, I congratulate Brownie for his selfless dedication to his fellow workers, neighbors, and countrymen.●

DEEP OCEAN DISPOSAL OF DECOMMISSIONED NUCLEAR SUBMARINES

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the Washington Post article on Saturday, March 27, entitled "Ocean Burial for Old Nuclear Subs." The article pertains to

the Navy's plans to develop a draft environmental impact statement (EIS) as announced on January 14 in a notice in the Federal Register.

The draft EIS, scheduled for release this summer, will discuss two options for permanent disposal of nuclear reactor components and submarines. The options include disposal at Department of Energy landsites in either Savannah, Ga., or Hanford, Wash., and deep ocean disposal. The Navy has made preliminary evaluations which indicate that the U.S. coastline exhibits ocean areas that meet international site criteria. The Navy has investigated two initial sites, which include one area off the coast of California, approximately 160 nautical miles southwest of Cape Mendocino; and one area off the coast of North Carolina, approximately 200 nautical miles southeast of Cape Hatteras.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries maintains jurisdiction over the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 which regulates or prohibits the transportation of waste materials for the purpose of disposal in ocean waters seaward of the baseline. In order for the Navy to dispose of the decommissioned, defueled submarines in the ocean, it is required to submit formal application to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for an ocean dumping permit. The Navy has not decided that the ocean option is the best alternative and more than likely will not be prepared to make a decision until the latter part of 1983.

The committee has conducted two oversight hearings to determine the existing records of, and possible impacts from, past ocean dumping practices that included low-level radioactive waste dumped between the years 1946 and 1967. The results of those hearings, and others conducted by the Congress, have shown that a considerable amount of uncertainty remains with respect to the exact locations and contents of approximately 90,000 containers of low-level radioactive wastes. At the same time, the scientific data available indicate that no environmental or public health hazard exists. Additionally, a recent General Accounting Office (GAO) report states that "scientists estimate that as much as 90 percent of the wastes dumped have already decayed to innocuous levels."

I am relieved that present scientific findings indicate no immediate hazard but I regard the disposal of radioactive waste in any environment as a move that we should approach cautiously and with the best management technologies. All too often the news media contain stories of toxic waste sites that have led to contamination of precious groundwater supplies or the closing of coastal waters to fishermen because of pollutant contamination. While permanent solutions are criti-

cally needed to aid the huge volumes of nuclear and solid wastes that are stockpiled around the Nation, the most feasible and environmentally safe mechanisms should be employed to protect our life-dependent resources.

With these considerations in mind, therefore, I would like to announce to my colleagues the plans of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee to focus on the Navy's deep sea option for scuttling the submarines. I plan to schedule an oversight hearing later this spring, possibly in the vicinity of Cape Hatteras, to determine the possible environmental and health impacts that might be expected from such disposal techniques and to invite scientists and engineers to comment publicly on the deep ocean proposal.

For the convenience of my colleagues who may not have had the opportunity to read this article, I include this article, "Ocean Burial for Old Nuclear Subs," in its entirety, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

OCEAN BURIAL WEIGHED FOR OLD NUCLEAR SUBS

(By George C. Wilson)

The Navy is considering sinking its old radioactive submarines in the depths of the ocean, fresh evidence that the arms race is compounding the gigantic problem of disposing of nuclear wastes.

The Navy has five old nuclear-powered submarines waiting for burial, either in the ocean or on land. More subs will soon be lined up behind them.

"With over 100 nuclear-powered submarines in operation, the Navy is faced with eventual decommissioning of these ships at a future rate of possibly three or four per year over the next 30 years, and a permanent means of disposal must be developed that is environmentally acceptable," the Navy said in a statement signaling its intention to start assessing burial sites.

Today's nuclear attack submarines cost \$850 million each, while the giant Trident missile sub has a price tag of about \$1.3 billion.

One option for disposing of worn-out submarines is to take the nuclear fuel out and then dump the ships in deep parts of the Atlantic or Pacific. The other is to cut out the radioactive sections housing the power plant and send them to the Energy Department's burial grounds in Savannah, Ga., and Hanford, Wash.

A Navy spokesman said yesterday that his service is taking the first step toward finding a final resting place for nuclear submarines: preparing an environmental impact statement, a process expected to take about 18 months.

Although the Navy defangs its retired nuclear submarines by taking out the nuclear fuel, the metal in the power plant that surrounded it stays radioactive for years, with cobalt 60 the main source of radiation. However, the Navy stressed in its formal notice—printed Jan. 14 in the Federal Register—that it would take great pains to protect the environment and did not believe radioactivity from the subs would turn out to be a high risk.

Stressing that it has not decided which way to go, the Navy said sinking the subma-

ries in deep water would be cheaper than land disposal. "If the sea disposal option were to be selected, the submarine reactor plant would be defueled and all the nuclear fuel would be removed from the ship," the Navy said. "Hull integrity would be restored and the ship prepared for towing and for flooding in such a manner that it would land on the ocean bottom intact with reactor plant containment maintained."

The Navy conceded that the radioactive metal in the reactor would rust out eventually, no matter whether the subs were buried in the ocean or on land, but it estimated that the release of radiation would be at safe, "negligible" levels by then. The study under way is designed to assess the risks.

If the Navy opts for sea disposal, the Environmental Protection Agency would have to grant a permit for a specific part of the ocean—a process that could take up to three years, including time for possible consultations with foreign governments as required by the London Dumping Convention. Land disposal would be quicker, with the administrative work taking between one and two years.

The Navy has been investigating as potential dumping grounds an area of the Atlantic 17,000 feet deep, 200 miles southeast of Cape Hatteras, N.C., and a spot in the Pacific about 14,000 feet deep around 150 miles southwest of Cape Mendocino, Calif.

Two U.S. nuclear submarines lie at the bottom of the Atlantic—the Thresher, lost in 1963, and the Scorpion, which sank in 1968. No one survived either sinking. There is also the likelihood that some Soviet nuclear-powered submarines have sunk. The Soviet Golf-class submarine that the Glomar Explorer tried to raise off Hawaii in 1974 was diesel-powered but carried nuclear missiles. It sank in 1968.

The Navy said it has detected radioactivity from cobalt 60 in the sea bottom near the Thresher and the Scorpion but not in the surrounding water, marine life or debris.

The Navy in 1959 dumped part of the power plant of the submarine Seawolf in 9,000 feet of water 120 miles off the Atlantic coast. "No significant effect on the marine environment is expected," the Navy said.

Concern about the health risks of burying radioactive material at sea or on land is sure to mount once the Navy tries to win public acceptance of a specific plan. Now awaiting decisions on their final resting places are the attack submarines Nautilus, expected to stay on land as a monument, Triton and Halibut and the missile subs Theodore Roosevelt and Abraham Lincoln.●

JESSE BRENT, WATERWAY STATESMAN

HON. DAVID R. BOWEN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. BOWEN. Mr. Speaker, last month the Nation and our State of Mississippi lost a great leader and many of us lost a close personal friend in Mr. Jesse Brent of Greenville.

He was not the kind of leader often extolled in these Halls, that is, a national political figure or statesman in the conventional sense, but he was a statesman, a leader of men and indus-

try, a man with the standards, ideals, and ability that have made our Nation great.

Jesse Brent was born in 1912, in a small town in south Mississippi, Rockport, and he was raised in Vicksburg on the banks of the Mississippi River. At the age of 18 he went to work as a riverboat deckhand with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for \$2 a day, the beginning of a long career on the waterways of America.

Later he and his father ran a boat service up the Yazoo and Sunflower rivers, supplying the Mississippi-Delta farm area northeast of Vicksburg. In the early 1940's he moved from Vicksburg north to another Mississippi River port, Greenville, and, along with Gilda McCool, Bilbo Williamson, and Percy LeMay, started the first towing company in Greenville.

In 1956 Jesse Brent sold his share of that company and started Brent Towing Co. with one towboat and two barges. With hard work, ambition, and foresight his company has grown to its present capacity of 22 towboats and 55 barges, employing over 600 people, making it one of the largest privately owned companies in the industry. In addition to the towing company, Jesse Brent also established Brent Marine Supply in 1961 and bought Superior Boat Works in 1966.

Jesse Brent must certainly be regarded as "the father of the towboat industry" in Greenville and the man most responsible personally for the economic development of that industry there than any other single man. As a result of his pioneering leadership and his encouraging the establishment of other firms, even though they might be competitors, Greenville now has 28 towboat-related corporations employing over 2,500 people with an annual payroll of more than \$25 million.

From this leadership base in Greenville, Miss., he served as chairman of the board of the American Waterways Operators, a member of the executive committee of the Water Resources Congress, the board of directors of the National Waterways Conference, the Intracoastal Canal Association, and other waterway organizations.

Jesse Brent was not only a great national leader in the towboat and barge industry, but he was very active in grassroots politics, in civic, humanitarian religions and philanthropic activities. He served on the board of trustees of Millsaps College in Jackson, Miss., where I once taught; he was president of the Greenville Chamber of Commerce and the Greenville Community Fund, and a board member of the Delta Council and a leader in his Methodist Church.

Jesse Brent was nonpartisan in his political activities and was willing to support an unknown candidate for public office, such as I was 10 years

ago when I first ran for Congress, as he was established public figures.

The State of Mississippi, the waterway industry of the Nation, the city of Greenville, and a great many people throughout the Nation have all benefited from his leadership, his advice, his financial support, and his personal friendship.

His distinguished family will carry on in the great tradition that Jesse Brent has established. His wife, Ruth, is a community leader in her own right, and his sons, Howard and Lea, will continue to administer the company in their father's great waterway tradition; they and his other children, Betty Jo Hines and Barbara Wasson, and all of Jesse and Ruth Brent's 17 grandchildren and 9 great-grandchildren in a growing family of leadership and distinction will carry forward the virtues, ideals, and standards exemplified in the name and memory of a great Mississippian and a great American, Jesse E. Brent.●

NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION ACT OF 1978

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief statement in support of a bill Mr. BINGHAM and I and more than 35 of our colleagues are introducing today to strengthen the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act (NNPA) of 1978. Mr. BINGHAM has for many years been a motivating force behind congressional activity to stem the proliferation tide. We owe him much for his efforts.

It seems incredible that some 37 years after the first nuclear explosion we continue to be uncertain about the dangers of nuclear weapons spread and how much of a price we should be willing to pay to prevent it. We now have a President who said during his campaign that proliferation was none of our business. Fortunately his views moderated once he was forced to confront the harsh realities of office.

For those who believe proliferation to be a matter not deserving of our attention, I think it worth noting the dangers. First is that the likelihood of regional nuclear conflicts increases greatly with the number of nuclear weapons powers. As the number of nuclear nations increases, so does the likelihood that a regional conflict will trigger a nuclear war among the superpowers. The use of nuclear weapons by other countries, even if such use were limited to one area of the world, would tend to legitimize use of these weapons, thereby setting the stage for a holocaust whose dimensions defy com-

prehension. Along with the increased number of nuclear weapons goes the prospect of these weapons falling into the hands of irrational governments or terrorists.

For too many years we have been unable to adopt a clear policy based on acceptance of significant restrictions upon our own activities in order to prevent acquisition of nuclear weapons related technology by other countries. While proliferation has always been considered bad in principle the question has been how much we would be willing to pay to prevent it. The answer too often has been that we were not willing to pay very much. We came forth instead with rationalizations for giving our commercial interests priority over our proliferation concerns. We told ourselves either that proliferation did not make that much difference, or that there was nothing we could do to prevent it, or that the best course was to expend our involvement in international commerce because this would enhance our influence on the safeguards system intended to deter diversion of nuclear materials from peaceful to military uses.

Too often we closed our eyes to what was going on. Now five nations make no secret of their nuclear arsenals. In addition to these five nations, Israel more likely than not has a nuclear capability. India has tested a nuclear explosive. South Africa and Pakistan are way down the road. Argentina is getting itself in a position where it can produce nuclear explosive materials. Taiwan and South Korea could acquire nuclear explosives if they were to feel threatened.

It is with these ideas in mind that I am cosponsoring Mr. BINGHAM's legislation that seeks to strengthen existing law.

Our proposed bill deals with nuclear commerce that could contribute to an ominous spread of the ability to produce high-enriched uranium and plutonium which could be fabricated into nuclear weapons. Our proposed legislation would help to assure we do not bargain away existing constraints on nuclear exports in order to improve commercial prospects of our ailing nuclear industry. We must continue to establish and maintain a high standard for export licenses against which performance of other nuclear supplier nations can be judged. We must encourage other nuclear suppliers to follow our example.

Clearly our proposed legislation is but one piece in the continuing evolution of a program to prevent further nuclear weapons spread. Our policies and decisions must be designed to minimize the premature commercialization of plutonium as a reactor fuel. We should discourage use of reactors that use plutonium by convincing other governments that there is sufficient

uranium and enrichment capacity to provide fuel for at least several decades.

Finally we should recognize the inadequacies of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards systems when we approve nuclear exports. We should be aware that the NRC has stated its concern "that the IAEA safeguards system would not detect a diversion—of nuclear explosive materials—in at least some types of facilities." The Commission also said that it was "not confident that the IAEA member states would be notified of a diversion in a timely fashion." In carrying out oversight of the NRC, I intend to make sure that the Commission subjects all license applications for nuclear exports to strict reviews that take full account of the limited capability of the IAEA safeguards.

In sum, our purpose is to place impediments in the way of acquisition of nuclear weapons by other countries. If we are successful, we will have paid a small price for having diminished the likelihood of a nuclear catastrophe.●

A RADIOACTIVE FALLOUT BILL

HON. DAN MARRIOTT

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. MARRIOTT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to remedy a situation of great injustice. For 30 years, the Federal Government has failed to behave responsibly, and it is now time for Congress to take matters into its own hands. This Government's record of disgrace must be cleared.

Between January 1, 1951, and July 31, 1962, the U.S. Government exploded a series of nuclear bombs. These tests were open atmospheric tests producing radioactive fallout clouds. Following a number of individual shots, fallout clouds were tracked through southeastern Nevada, southern Utah, and Arizona.

These were not unpopulated areas. Rather, there were at least 170,000 men, women, and children who lived within the shadow of the testing. They breathed the air that carried the radioactive fallout, drank the milk and ate the beef contaminated by the radioisotopes deposited on the ground and ingested by the cows. Throughout it all, the Government told these people that the radioactive fallout posed no harm.

Since that time, the health effects resulting from the atmospheric testing have become apparent. The incidence of cancer in these areas is extraordinarily high. The rate for leukemia alone tripled between 1950 and 1967. Families involved have been decimated

by the radioactivity to which they were exposed. One southern Utah man I know lost his wife and nine other close relatives due to cancer, a highly improbable occurrence statistically.

The U.S. Government can no longer afford to ignore the plight of these patriotic American citizens who unwittingly became victims of our nuclear testing program.

My bill proposes a remedy. It is a simple attempt to deal in a fair and equitable, yet scientific way, with the painful results of actions undertaken during an unusual period in American history.

The bill amends Federal tort claims procedures, acknowledging the Federal Government's compassionate and inherent responsibility to these citizens. It presents a reasonable solution to the difficult to accept, yet unavoidable problem of direct causation on the part of our Government.

We know certain cancers are produced by radiation exposure. Clinically, we cannot distinguish whether or not one particular case was caused by radiation exposure and another was not. But, the overwhelming fact remains that the incidences of these cancer types are increasing in the areas where our Government performed nuclear testing. And the only conclusion we can draw, the only inherent and decent action we can take, is to accept that evidence and provide a remedy.

This is not to say we are providing blanket compensation to all cancer victims. Radioepidemiological studies can tell us what the probabilities are that any given cancer in a population was caused by radiation exposure. My bill would enable the court to use this evidence in determining those victims who have the highest likelihood of their cancer having been caused by exposure to the Nevada testing fallout. The evidence would be compiled in table form considering all the relevant factors of age, sex, cancer type, years from exposure to onset of cancer, and dose.

The bill also attempts to make old and current information regarding dose levels from the fallout available to plaintiffs. It requires the Secretary of Energy to publish charts giving environmental exposure levels for the different geographic areas involved.

My bill proposes a reasonable solution to a problem that should have been taken care of years ago. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation which only attempts to do what is fair, right, and just.

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF MARRIOTT BILL

PREFACE TO ANALYSIS

The bill does amend federal tort claims procedures to require the court in fallout cases to consider radioepidemiological evidence in reaching its conclusion and in making an award.

The burden of proof still rests with the plaintiff to demonstrate a reasonable likelihood of having received a particular dose of radiation from the fallout.

SECTION 2692—STANDING

In order to have standing, two criteria must be met:

1. Plaintiff must have been a resident of the United States or one of its territories during open air atomic tests conducted between January 1, 1951 and July 31, 1962;
2. Plaintiff must have a radiation-related cancer that was diagnosed after January 1, 1952; or
3. Plaintiff must be the estate of a deceased person who met conditions 1 and 2.

SECTION 2693—SECRETARY ACTION

Secretary of Health and Human Services must determine and publish a list of radiation-related cancers (within 60 days).

Secretary of Health and Human Services must develop and publish radio-epidemiological tables that estimate the probabilities that various radiation-related cancers could have been caused by radiation exposure (within one year of enactment):

Calculations must be for exposures ranging from 1 millirad to 1,000 rads.

Must consider relevant factors such as sex, age, type of cancer, etc.

Probability of causation is expressed in a percentage figure.

Secretary of HHS must publish formulas and data from which tables were derived.

Secretary should use the best available data and update every four years.

Secretary of Energy must develop and publish charts which give environmental exposure levels for different geographic areas:

Environmental exposure level is the level of radioactivity in the air.

Measurement will be expressed in Roentgens.

All tables and charts are to be promulgated under procedures which allow for consideration and comment by all interested individuals.

SECTION 2694—DISCOVERY OF INFORMATION

The intent of this section is to make available under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure all information and data relative to dose measurement and assessment.

Secretary of Energy must publish a descriptive bibliography of materials held by the Federal government.

Court is provided with access to classified materials for use in a case but without release to the public.

SECTION 2695—COMPENSATION

Compensation may be awarded by the court to anyone who has been found to have a Probability of Causation of 10% or higher.

Compensation is to be pro-rated with higher probabilities receiving larger awards.

	Percentage		
	10 to 29	30 to 49	50 to 100
Money points.....	\$3,000	\$4,000	\$5,000
Maximum benefit.....	500,000		

For example: 10% Probability of Causation (PC), \$30,000 award; 15% PC, \$45,000 award; 30% PC, \$120,000 award; 40% PC, \$160,000 award; 50% PC, \$250,000; 70% \$350,000; and 100% PC, \$500,000.

The acceptance of such an award released any further claim against the government except if within ten years after acceptance an updating of the tables or formulas raises an individual's probability of causation.

SECTION 2696—STANDARD OF PROOF

Individual must demonstrate to the court a reasonable likelihood that a particular dose was received.

That dose will be the maximum credible dose which is a dose which is 95% probable to be at least as high as the dose he received.

If the individual fails to demonstrate this through a preponderance of the evidence, the court can determine the maximum credible dose. The court shall consider both external and internal exposure from ingested radionuclides in its determination of dose.

Presumption of validity is not given to Federal records.

SECTION 2697—EXCLUSIVE REMEDY

The procedure outlined is the only remedy available to persons claiming injury from radioactive fallout from nuclear testing.

Any award will not preclude the possibility of obtaining any other federally funded benefits.

SECTION 2698—STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

A plaintiff must file action within two years after the date of enactment, or within two years of a cancer diagnosis, whichever is later.

SECTION 2699

Awards are non-taxable.

SECTION 2700—LIMITS ON ATTORNEYS FEES

Attorneys fees are limited to 10% of the first \$100,000, and 5% of any excess.

Prescribes penalties—maximum of \$5,000, or 1 year, or both.

SECTION 2701

Awards will not require a person to reimburse insurance companies.

IMPROVEMENT IN THE EXTENDED UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS PROGRAM

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most sorrowful, yet accurate, reflections of the failure of the Reagan economic program is the ever-increasing number of unemployed Americans. Nationwide, the unemployment rate is 8.8 percent. The number of unemployed persons for the month of February was 9.6 million, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. In my own western New York region the jobless rate for the Erie/Niagara Counties area is a horrendous 14.3 percent—the worst rate since the depression. In Orleans County, the unemployment rate was also unconscionably high: 14.1 percent; fortunately Monroe County was not nearly as bad, but its rate has also risen from 5.6 percent in January 1981 to 7.3 percent today.

Indeed, the total level of unemployment is actually higher, because these figures listed above do not reflect the people who have been unemployed for so long that they are not even counted among the Nation's jobless.

What is truly unfortunate is that not only is the economy causing hardship by increasing the number of Americans out of work, but the unemployment insurance system, itself—the system which is supposed to provide aid and sustenance to the families of unemployed workers—is also replete with inconsistencies and nonsensical provisions. Clearly it is an inequitable and ill-designed system which denies extended benefits for the workers in my congressional district which suffers chronic high unemployment, due to our reliance on the troubled auto and steel industries, while such benefits are paid in other States which are actually economically healthier. I can assure my colleagues that the unemployed workers of New York State are every bit as unemployed as their fellow citizens in Mississippi or California. Yet, in those States extended benefits are now being paid, while in New York State they have been cut off for well over a year.

Accordingly, today I am introducing legislation to revamp the system by which eligibility for extended unemployment benefits is calculated.

First, I must take a few moments to describe the current extended unemployment benefits system and how it operates to prevent citizens in some States from obtaining much-needed aid.

The extended benefits program provides up to 13 additional weeks of benefits to those individuals who have exhausted their regular unemployment benefits. Funding for the extended benefits program is shared equally by the Federal and State governments and is "triggered-on" when the insured unemployment rate (IUR) in a State is 4 percent and, in addition, is 120 percent higher than it was during the same period in the previous 2 years. Alternatively, a State may "trigger-on" when its IUR reaches a flat 5 percent. It is worth noting that under the terms of the Reconciliation Act, starting October 1, 1982, it will be even more difficult for a State to "trigger-on" because the State will have to reach a 5 percent IUR—and be 120 percent higher than during the corresponding period for the previous 2 years—or reach a flat 6 percent IUR.

What is crucial to understanding this system of determining benefits is that the IUR differs radically from the actual level of unemployment. This is because the IUR calculation only considers those persons who are covered by the unemployment insurance program. People who are out of work for so long that they no longer qualify for unemployment benefits and those individuals who have not worked long enough to qualify for coverage, are not included when the IUR is determined. Obviously, though, such

people are very much a part of the unemployed work force.

Because of the anomalous way in which extended benefits are calculated, a State with many people who have been out of work for a lengthy period of time, and obviously has very high real unemployment, may have a very low IUR because many of the unemployed citizens no longer are covered by unemployment compensation.

As illogical as the IUR measure is during normal times, it is particularly inappropriate and harsh during a recession. The IUR is artificially low during a recession because by its very mathematical formulation it compares the number of people collecting benefits now—when unemployment is high—with the number of people employed in the work force a year ago—before the recession began. The resulting IUR measure makes the unemployment rate appear less than it is in reality.

The folly of the IUR is demonstrated by the fact that it is not used for determining benefits for any other Government program. The IUR is not used for determining funding for CETA prime sponsors, nor for economic development assistance nor for funding under the Defense Manpower Act or any other Government program which targets money to an area based upon that area's level of unemployment.

The IUR measure is used for just one reason: It is simple to calculate because it only counts those people who are actually collecting benefits at a given time. But, it is clearly inequitable when we realize that those people collecting benefits do not necessarily represent the true unemployment picture in a State. State eligibility rules for determining who collects unemployment insurance differ widely among States and, as pointed out earlier, the IUR system tends to ignore those areas which have high chronic underlying levels of unemployment—those areas most in need of extra assistance.

To keep in mind how inaccurate the IUR is as a measure of unemployment consider this: In New York State the total unemployment rate—as measured by the current population survey—is 9 percent. However, the IUR in New York State is only 4.15 percent—plus it is 97 percent higher than it was in the same period during the previous 2 years. This is far short of the needed 120 percent higher figure which is needed to "trigger-on" the State to extended benefits.

The bill which I am introducing makes some fundamental changes in the system by which extended unemployment benefits are determined. The bill eliminates the IUR calculation and permits a State to "trigger-on" to extended benefits when the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate

for a State reaches 7 percent. The seasonally adjusted rate is calculated each month so it should not prove to be a problem to use this readily available statewide data for calculating eligibility for extended benefits.

The changes encompassed in my bill would have several beneficial features:

First, eligibility for extended benefits would be measured by a formula which more realistically portrays the unemployment picture in a State, than does the IUR calculation. The current population survey, unlike the IUR, does count those people who have exhausted regular unemployment benefits and are still looking for work—the very people who are supposed to be aided by the extended benefits programs.

Second, eligibility for extended benefits would be tied to a formulation with which people can identify. Nothing could be more galling to an unemployed worker than to hear that he cannot qualify for extended benefits because the insured unemployment rate must reach 4 percent when he or she knows for a fact that the true level of unemployment is 8, 10, 12 percent, or higher.

Third, my bill may very likely save money to the Federal and State governments. Under current estimates of the U.S. Department of Labor, somewhere between 35 and 46 States may "trigger-on" to the extended benefits program if it continues to operate under current law. Clearly, if benefits are paid in 46 States the extended benefits program will be very costly. The hallmark of my bill, however, is that it is neither too costly because it is too generous, nor inexpensive because it fails to provide aid where needed. Rather, it is fair because it targets the money for extended benefits where it is needed. Any program which provides aid must be based upon a system which distributes that money fairly and, which is perceived as being fair. Surely, the current IUR system does not meet those standards.

I have chosen a 7-percent seasonally adjusted rate for my bill because the national seasonally adjusted unemployment rate in July 1981, at the time the recession "officially" began was 7.2 percent. Therefore, the figure I am recommending represents a number which reflects the underlying unemployment rate which this country experienced prior to the most recent wave of economic adversity which has required our taking action to improve the system for figuring extended benefits.

Ultimately, of course, we need to embark upon an economic program which restores the health of our economy and returns workers to their jobs. In the meantime there are millions of Americans who are experiencing the pain and hardship of unemployment

and we need to address their immediate fate.

This bill restores fairness and logic to the extended benefits program and will provide an extra measure of sustenance to those who sorely need additional benefits. ●

THE LAW OF THE SEA NEGOTIATIONS

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1982

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the record excerpts from a recent article by Mr. Basil N. Petrou on the subject of the Law of the Sea negotiations.

Mr. Petrou has double degrees in both law and business from the University of Chicago. In 1974, he was U.S. Treasury representative on the U.S. delegation to the Law of the Sea Conference. Mr. Petrou has extensive experience with and knowledge of the subject.

I call attention to this article particularly for those of the Congress who have been told that the Law of the Sea Treaty will usher in harmony and order on the world's oceans. The reality of the situation is that the reverse is more probable.

TREATY SUMMARY

The key provisions of the proposed, 180-page treaty are:

(1) The territorial sea of a coastal state is 12 miles wide with a 24-mile contiguous zone, wherein it can take measures to prevent violations of its territorial sea rights.

(2) The coastal state has "sovereign rights" over resources within an exclusive economic zone (the continental shelf) extending up to 200 miles off a nation's coast.

(3) If the continental shelf extends beyond 200 miles, the coastal state still retains sovereign control but will be "taxed" for resources exploited beyond the 200-mile limit. Developing nations importing minerals would be exempt from this tax.

(4) Vessel transit, laying of pipelines and overflight conditions are all set forth in detail for that area beyond coastal state jurisdiction.

(5) An International Seabed Authority will be set up to regulate and participate in the exploitation of the deep seabed. All deep seabed technology will be required to be transferred both to the Authority and to developing states.

(6) The Authority will be allowed to finance its operating costs by raising capital from member nations. No member will have veto power. According to U.N. principles, this would mean that the United States will be required to finance 25 percent of the operating costs while not being guaranteed representation on the Authority.

(7) Private companies will be subject to an up-front fee, yearly rent until production commences and, thereafter, production charges. Private companies in turn will receive only a share of their profits, all of which go to the Authority. Additionally,

conditions governing mining rights can be altered every five years and changed altogether after 15 years.

(8) Three courts or arbitral tribunals will be set up to handle disputes arising from the treaty.

U.S. POSITION: PAST AND PRESENT

At the first United Nations conference in 1958, the 90 participating nations (including the United States) agreed to give jurisdiction of the continental shelf to the coastal state. Additionally, general principles of law were specifically codified regarding freedoms of navigation, fishing, laying of submarine cables and pipelines, and overflight. At the second U.N. conference in 1960, the United States proposed a 6-mile territorial sea while most other nations favored a 12-mile limit. The 1960 conference failed totally.

In 1969, the U.N. General Assembly passed a resolution which declared that, until the establishment of an international regime following a comprehensive LOS treaty, exploitation of resources beyond the limits of national jurisdiction were prohibited, and that no claim to any part of that area or its resources would be recognized. The United States and most other developed nations voted against this "moratorium" resolution. Nevertheless, the resolution passed by a vote of 68 to 12.

In 1970, the United States called for an international conference on vessel transit issues and the deep seabed and agreed to a U.N. resolution prohibiting claims that would be incompatible with the international regime to be established. By doing so, it left the door open for the developing nations to press successfully for a comprehensive Law of the Sea conference covering all ocean issues.

Since 1976, there have been ten sessions of the Third Law of the Sea conference. In exchange for high seas freedom for vessel transit in a coastal state's exclusive economic zone and related protection against potential restrictions on vessel transit through international straits, the United States essentially has conceded the following points relating to a deep seabed authority:

- (1) the right of the Authority to mine;
- (2) a system for "banking" deep seabed sites;
- (3) transfer of mining technology to the Authority;
- (4) financing of the Authority by member states;
- (5) a formula limiting deep seabed mineral production to projected growth in the nickel market; and
- (6) periodic review by member nations of the rights granted to seabed miners.

By December 1980, government officials had completed their review of the U.S. position on the Law of the Sea treaty and all participating agencies supported continuation of the negotiations. These negotiations reconvened last August in Geneva where the U.S. delegation presented the following list of treaty changes:

- (1) renegotiation of the present requirement to pay the Seabed Authority a 1-7% per year share of the volume or revenues realized from production on the continental shelf but beyond 200 miles;
- (2) a permanent U.S. seat on the Seabed Council;
- (3) deletion of any reference to production limits from the text;
- (4) no mandatory transfer of company technology to developing nations although technology transfer to the Authority was acceptable; and

(5) a protection of investment clause to give private companies already operating in the deep seabed mine site priority before the treaty is ratified.

INVESTMENT IMPLICATIONS

Companies and nations desiring to exploit the ocean will now have to contend with Law of the Sea negotiations and the resulting potential treaty. Already seven consortiums have filed for licenses to begin exploring, hopefully by 1988. Four of the consortiums are led by U.S. companies: Lockheed Systems Co., Inc., Kennecott Corp. (Sohio), Essex Minerals Co. (U.S. Steel Corp.), and Inco, Inc.

These companies and others will have to deal with at least five areas of concern:

(1) INCREASED REGULATION:

Without an LOS treaty, ocean usage has been regulated by the acts of nations as they accede to, or oppose, an amalgam of national laws, assertions of territorial jurisdiction, international treaties, and decisions of the International Court of Justice. As a result, businesses that presently use ocean resources, travel the ocean surface, or drill the ocean floor are for the most part free to conduct their operations as they see fit until or unless challenged by a coastal state. The deep seabed area is now without widely accepted national or international jurisdictional claims. In June 1980, Congress passed the Deep Seabed Hard Mineral Resources Act which allows the United States to license seabed exploration after July 1, 1981, while delaying actual mining until January 1, 1988. Under this legislation (especially as it may be linked with similar legislation now on the books of other developed nations), private companies are free to operate under hospitable legal and economic terms.

But if LOS is accepted, exploitation of ocean resources would be more heavily regulated. That which is within 200 miles or on the "continental shelf" would be subject to extensive coastal state jurisdiction, while that which is beyond 200 miles would be subject to control by the new International Seabed Authority.

Not only will economic activity be subject to regulation, but there also can be a fine distinction between deep seabed economic activity and military uses tied to mining technology. It may be recalled that in 1974, Hughes Tool was thought to be mining for manganese nodules until several newspapers reported it was really attempting to recover a Russian submarine from the deep ocean floor.

With internationally agreed-upon expanded coastal state jurisdiction, some coastal states may feel comfortable in asserting this new jurisdiction for political advantages, such as an assertion that "hostile" military vessels had violated their expanded offshore jurisdiction. It also seems probable that foreign naval powers may have to demand rights to unhindered transit. The recent example of U.S. jets downing Libyan aircraft within Libyan-claimed "historic bays" may well be repeated in other parts of the world. Companies that operate as foreign offshore drilling entities may find themselves in the middle of such international squabbles.

(2) TAXATION:

Under the proposed LOS treaty, any production of seabed resources beyond 200 miles would be "taxed." On a nation's outer continental shelf, this means that mineral or hydrocarbon production beyond 200 miles would be subject to an international excise tax beginning at 1% of volume or value and escalating to 7% per year. The

Authority would "tax" the host nation which undoubtedly would pass on this levy to the companies engaged in the venture. Additionally, most host nations would like see this excise tax as incremental to the normal income tax and royalty currently imposed. The IRS position on this tax is unclear, but because it is unique to oil and gas production and imposed over and above a foreign country's normal corporate tax, the IRS could argue that the payments should not be creditable against U.S. taxes. As a result, even though the deep water technology exists, private companies would be less willing to drill and produce on the continental shelf beyond 200 miles off a coast.

In the deep seabed, each private company would be subject to an initial \$500,000 fee, \$1 million a year in rent, and production charges thereafter. Supplementing these direct taxes, each company will be required to pick two sites, one of which the Authority will "choose" to mine itself. Not only are the start-up and production costs artificially high as a result of the Authority's "taxation," but all profits would go to the Authority to be shared by all participants. The productive and profitable organizations would be required to share their profits with those less efficient, causing their after-tax return to diminish even further. Thus, the Law of the Sea treaty can be expected to sharply reduce private exploration and mining of the deep seabed.

In addition to taxation beyond 200 miles, there is the possibility that coastal states would impose new direct or indirect taxes on vessels transiting coastal waters within the 200-mile limit even though prior experience and the intent of the treaty text suggests they would not immediately do so.

(3) TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER:

In addition to regulation and taxation, the LOS would require a mandatory transfer of a company's deep sea technology to at least the Authority and maybe even to developing nations. As a result, even though major multinational companies have the technology to develop deep sea mining, there would be much less incentive to use it under LOS. If, then, the demand rises for ocean-produced resources, prices can be expected to rise faster, since the option of private deep seabed mining has been effectively stifled.

(4) TRANSIT CONTROVERSIES:

With an LOS treaty, commercial vessels would be subject to more harassment due to the economic "zone" created offshore and managed by the coastal state. The United States was not able to get high seas rules for vessel transit in these zones. Instead, only general freedom of navigation and overflight and "other internationally lawful uses of the sea related to these freedoms" are expressed. This clause is intentionally ambiguous to such an extent that the Reagan Administration transition team reported that the treaty would "contribute to the erosion of the high seas freedom of navigation and overflight." The wording certainly opens the door for politically preferential interpretations.

(5) ESTABLISHED PRECEDENT:

And finally, long term, a new precedent would have been set concerning what has heretofore been considered *res nullius*, "something owned by no one." The Law of the Sea treaty would effectively state that the unknown reaches of the deep ocean should not be unowned, but rather commonly owned as mankind's heritage. Unfortu-

nately, this common heritage would be dominated by Third World regulations. Because the ocean would have been so defined, the same is likely to be applied to other "un-owned" resources and unregulated areas such as outer space (e.g. geostationary orbits above the earth) and Antarctica.

This precedent is all the more troublesome because the history of U.S. involvement in the Law of the Sea conference and support for a "common heritage" principle can only be corrected by active U.S. opposition to such claims during the remaining negotiations. It is the nature of international law that a nation must actively assert its opposition to such claims of jurisdiction and interpretations of treaty text as they are expressed in various ways by other nations. The greater the number of adherents to a treaty, the more assertive must be the dissenting nation.

The second general problem follows from this requirement that nations act on their beliefs. Regardless of whether or not President Reagan withdraws the United States from the Law of the Sea negotiations, the world is left with 10 years of deliberations during which the U.S. is on the record as favoring claims of coastal state jurisdiction which would prove harmful not only to business but also to military interests. Such U.S.-supported claims will come to haunt us during future bilateral negotiations and world court deliberations, where they can be used to indicate creation of customary international law by consensus. This is probably true even if the Law of the Sea conference totally collapses without a single nation signing the present draft treaty, something not likely to happen given the negligible costs to the Third World in signing the present draft treaty.

IMPLICATIONS FOR BUSINESS

The International Seabed Authority, as presently designed, would employ redistribu-

tionist policies aimed at transferring wealth through taxation and regulation. Income and technology would be taken from developed nations and given to the Third World. The global effects of this shift in income and wealth would cancel each other while creating no new wealth. However, the authority's policies would create vast inefficiencies causing a significant substitution out of activity in this potentially vast field of endeavor.

In essence, an LOS treaty would create an effective international wedge in the production, utilization and distribution of basic raw material resources. This would, of course, imply a reduced supply to the market, increased costs to the consumer, and a decrease in the price received by the producers of the "taxed" activity. Differing impacts on the future capital budgets of various industries would be expected. Those companies which have already invested capital would suffer immediate consequences. Such companies would include members of the seven consortiums which already have filed for licenses to mine the deep seabed.

The only businesses that are sure to prosper in the new world of Law of the Sea are those which help a coastal state police its 200-mile exclusive economic zone. These companies might include defense industries (especially radar and sonar equipment producers).

In the coming months, the key factors to look for in determining the business impact of the conference will be how the United States attempts to address the deep seabed issues. If the United States wins the changes it is seeking, then we might expect the United States to sign the treaty. This will mean (assuming Senate ratification) that deep sea mining firms will have to deal with the new seabed Authority. Deep sea mining production likely would suffer. However, if the U.S. asks for other concessions related to vessel transit in addition to the

deep seabed changes, it will be a sign that the Reagan Administration is seeking to re-draft the treaty along tighter lines and may well set the stage for an end to the conference. In this case, deep sea mining companies will operate under various countries' legislation and mining is likely to proceed if mineral prices justify it.

Whichever way the United States goes, other industries operating on the oceans or on the continental shelves will face the problems noted above. The result is likely to be a retreat to "safer havens" for oil companies drilling on the continental shelves and an increased awareness of political problems associated with vessel transit through expanded coastal state waters. This recognized safety of the U.S. outer continental shelf (OCS) combined with Secretary Watt's expanded OCS oil and gas leasing schedule may influence more oil companies to search these waters than would otherwise have been the case.

THE DILEMMA

A nation which does not believe in international law can walk away from a treaty it does not like or even one it has signed. Such a nation feels free to interpret international laws on a day-to-day basis. The United States is not such a nation. It has been in the forefront of developing international institutions and laws. For this reason, it is in a dilemma of its own making on the Law of the Sea.

Other nations know that the United States must honor its treaties and over time will be influenced by its early concessions on Law of the Sea issues as these concessions have been embodied in the draft treaty. Thus, it seems that no matter what the United States does in the next few months, it has helped create an economically and politically difficult future for itself on and under the oceans.●